The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVII, No. 2 AUGUST, 1947

CONTENTS

The Rebirth of Scriptural Theology *Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.* 81

The Problem of St. Jerome . *Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R.* 102

New Policy for the Church in China? *Thaddeus Yang, O.S.B.* 108

On Teaching the Bible . . . . *John J. Dougherty* 112

Brownson on Salvation and the Church *Thomas R. Ryan, C.PP.S.* 117

Uniformity in the Funeral Rite . . *G. V. Predmore* 125

The Objective of the Diocesan Priesthood *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 131

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Missa in Aliena Ecclesia 147

Bless-ed or Blest 148

A Question of the Tone of Voice at Low Mass . . . 148

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1947, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Presence of Matter for Consecration 149

Acts of the Theological Virtues 149

Binding Force of a Promissory Oath 150

ANALECTA 152

BOOK REVIEWS

De baptismo et confirmatione, *by Emanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.* 155

A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States, *by John Tracy Ellis* 156

The Priest and a World Vision, *by James Keller, M.M.* . 156

Introductio in codicem, *by Udalricus Beste, O.S.B.* . . . 157

Slow Dawning, *by Jane Howes* 158

BOOK NOTES 160

SPECIAL REPRINT

FULL TEXT OF CONFIRMATION ADMINISTRATION BY PRIESTS

- **The Decree Spiritus Sancti munera**
- **Latin and English**
- **Commentary by Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.**

ORDER NOW for Immediate Delivery—In Gray Paper Cover, 20c each. 25 per cent Discount for Quantities of 100 or more.

THE
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington 17, D. C.

Announcing . . .

A COMMENTARY ON THE PENTECOSTAL SEQUENCE

The Veni Sancte Spiritus

By

REV. DR. NICHOLAS GIHR

Author of
"The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass"

Now Translated Into English for the First Time

By

Rev. L. M. Dooley, S.V.D.

A must for every ascetical library. Invaluable for every priest, seminarian, and religious. A rich mine for Holy Ghost sermons.

Limited Edition. Price $2.00

Order from—
Book Dept.
"MIRAMAR"
Island Creek, Mass.

THE REBIRTH OF SCRIPTURAL THEOLOGY

The Bible is the most-studied book in the world. Though a great deal of this study is conducted by those outside the Church, its results and findings are not without relevance to us also who enjoy the advantage of divine guidance through the Church in dealing with the maze of problems which the Scriptures raise when subjected to minute technical analysis. Both for their own scientific worth and for the bearing and influence they inescapably exert on Catholic biblical scholarship, the scriptural studies of leading thinkers outside the fold deserve on occasion some notice and appraisal. In the question of scriptural theology, non-Catholic biblical studies during the past century present a history that can prove both interesting and instructive.

EARLY BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AND ITS DEMISE

The last five years seen a burst of awareness and attention on the part of scripture students in this country and England to the basic question of the existence, nature, and methodology of biblical theology, i. e., to the study of the Bible's doctrine and spiritual significance to the individual, not merely its linguistic and historical aspects. Well over a dozen articles and half that many books have appeared since 1942 discussing this problem most seriously. It is my purpose here to present a survey and synopsis of these discussions, largely in the author's own words, to indicate what the situation is in the minds of these scholars, and what are its implications for us.

Up to the nineteenth century, as several of these recent articles point out, it was simply taken for granted that scripture studies primarily aim at perceiving the teaching of divine revelation in the Bible and arranging the findings in an orderly way for more scientific study. When the new critical method arose in the early nineteenth century, it was applied to the Scriptures without, at first, any change in attitude as to the sacred and unique character of Holy Writ. As J. D. Smart says in his historical study of this question, these pioneering scholars

> took their start from the axiom, so long unquestioned in the Church, that the Old Testament constitutes a necessary part of the record of the revelation from which the Church draws its life. They substituted

> a critical and historical approach for an uncritical one; they insisted upon the necessity of examining the writings of the Old Testament as literature and of applying scientific methods of literary and critical historical research, that each document might be set in its proper order and against its original background; but they did not question the unity of the two testaments or the significance of the Old Testament for Christian doctrine. On the contrary, they were convinced that the new approach greatly enhanced the value of the Old Testament for the Church and were eager to demonstrate the truth of this conviction by using the results of their investigations in a re-writing of Old Testament theology.[1]

This was possible because, although "the prophets [for example] were not systematic theologians in the sense that they present us with a systematized statement of their doctrine, nevertheless they were in full and conscious possession of a doctrine, one which interpreted the crises of life in terms of God's wrath and his grace."[2] Hence such scholars as Eichorn, DeWette, Ewald, Delitzsch, Davidson, and others of the period strove to be at once theologians, linguists, historians, and none of them had any doubt that the book they were investigating was of the first importance for Christian theology, apologetics, and piety.[3]

As the new movement progressed, more and more attention was given to the *development* of the religious thought of the Bible, especially in the Old Testament. Thus Schultz, in his *Old Testament Theology* (1895), to which he gave the significant sub-title "The Religion of Revelation in its Pre-Christian Stage of Development," defines biblical theology as that branch of theological science which gives a historical and genetic presentation of revealed religion in the stages of its growth.[4] Under the impact of the genetic-historical method, inevitably "biblical scholars came to be more and more interested in the task of recovering the details of an ancient culture and in reconstructing the history of that culture. The question of the relationship of biblical scholarship to systematic theology eventually ceased to concern them."[5] Hence it was that "Old Testament theology [as such] sickened and died and was quietly buried as the twentieth century began."[6]

---

[1] James D. Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," *The Journal of Religion*, XXIII (Jan. and April, 1943), 1-11; 125-736. Quotation is from p. 3.

[2] G. Ernest Wright, *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1944), pp. v f.

[3] Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," p.3. Smart's article, along with A. T. Olmstead's "History, Ancient World, and the Bible: Problems of Attitude and of Method," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* II (Jan., 1943), 1-34, together present a good historical survey of the main works and periods of non-Catholic biblical scholarship throughout the past century in regard to questions of theological approach.

[4] Cf. William A. Irwin, "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," *The Journal of Religion*, XXV (Oct., 1945), 236.

Several causes of this shift of emphasis and ideal in scriptural studies are assigned. For one thing, interest centered on histories of Israelite religion in its development and its relation to other Semitic cults and influences, so that practically no one wrote theological appraisals of the message of the Old Testament as the very Word of God. Increasing awareness in the light of archeological discoveries that the religion of Israel was not a static unit sprung full-blown from the beginning but had undergone various developments in the course of ages and under the influence of surrounding peoples, and that the practical religion of the people was often quite different from the pure Jahwism of Moses and the Prophets, led scholars to concentrate on the task of distinguishing the various periods of Hebrew religion and uncovering through the use of biblical and extra-biblical documents what was the actual religious life of the people in these different periods.[7] In other words, scholars came to study Old Testament religion in exactly the same way as other ancient Semitic religions, and fell into putting it on a level with them as naturalistic and superstitious, not unique divine revelation.

> With the rise of rationalism, all the premises of the Church were questioned, and the new study of the Bible threatened the foundations of the veneration in which it had been held. The traditions as to the date and authorship of the various books were challenged one by one, books were traced back to earlier documents or split asunder and assigned to various authors, and the sense of a divine hand behind the Bible was often lost in the study of the human processes that brought it together, and it became to many a common book and a merely human document. . . . to many, Biblical study became a matter of merely scientific investigation, the detached examination of an ancient

---

[5] Gerald Birney Smith, "A Quarter-Century of Theological Thinking in America," *Journal of Religion*, V (1925), 577.

[6] Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," p. 1.

[7] Smart, *ibid.* pp. 2, 6, 11.

> literature, and the establishment of its text and the meaning that text had for the original writers. To understand the times in which a book was written, to think oneself back into those times, and to feel anew the impact of the words upon their first hearers, was to reach the goal of Biblical study.[8]

Other factors were also at work:

> Discoveries of great importance in the fields of Assyriology, Egyptology, Arabic studies, and archeology drew the interest of scholars, and ancient cultures rather than of those aspects of the Old Testament which are of peculiar concern for the Christian church. This, in turn, had the effect of attracting to Old Testament studies the type of scholar whose interest is more the philological and the historical than the theological. The extreme unfriendliness of a certain kind of dogmatism, both in Britain and in America, toward all critical studies may also have inclined scholars to keep clear of dogmatic considerations and to confine their attention to a purely scientific investigation of the language, literature, and history of the Hebrews. There was a peril in meddling with theology.[9]

Besides, the natural outgrowth of Schleiermacher's influential principle, that the real essence of religion is personal religious "experience," was a comparative study of all religions of the world to find what common elements they possess and whether there does not emerge some higher formula for achieving this basic religious "experience." In this way, Judaism and Christianity became but two chapters in the science or philosophy of religion, on an equal footing with all the rest.[10]

Finally, the evident way in which different scholars consistently read into their interpretations of Scripture, perhaps unwittingly, their own pre-formed opinions and philosophical coloring (Hegelianism, pragmatism, and the like) led those enamored of the pure scientific method to break loose altogether from any theological moorings or terms of reference and to adhere rigidly to an entirely detached and objective method—a mere cold statement of what the Bible actually says in the light of pure philology, and a casting of this against its background of historical context and comparative religion, particularly of adjacent Oriental peoples.[11]

---

[8] H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of the Bible* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), p. 13.

[9] Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," p. 9.

[10] Smart, *ibid.* pp. 8 f.

HISTORICISM RAMPANT

The result of all this hyper-objective presentation of the literature, history, culture, and various phases of religious development of the ancient Jews was a discipline so secularized that it belonged far more appropriately in a faculty of liberal arts than in a faculty of theology.[12] Non-Catholic theology students in their seminaries thus came to be taught a bewildering mass of facts or conjectures on the political, economic, cultural phases of the ancient Hebrews, the disparate phases of development of Hebrew religion, the confusing theories of multiple authorship of the various sacred books, something of their poetic beauty and sonorous style, a great deal about demonology, nomad religion, peasant superstitions, prophetic and legalist approaches to religion, a mass of Babylonian and Canaanite and other Oriental myths and superstitions—but practically nothing about the positive religion of the Old Testament itself as a still vital message and the eternal Word of God.[13]

The up-to-date scripture teacher or commentator would thus come to evade the real issue of the inherent, eternally valid, personally important *religious significance* of the passage in question, and go off on other lines of analysis and reflection. In the presence of some thundering denunciation by Isaias, for example, of religious hypocrisy or defection, the scholar's attitude would not be one of bringing out the full force and meaning of the passage as Isaias intended it, but a flurry of "scientific" considerations of the externals: are we sure that we have here a correct translation of the original Hebrew text? Is the text itself sound, or has it suffered in transmission? What do the ancient translations into different languages have to say here? Who wrote the passage, anyhow—actually Isaias himself? Which Isaias—proto—deutero—or trito—Isaias? Or is not the passage perhaps an editorial insertion? The same thought occurs in Micheas;

---

[11] Cf. Smart, *ibid.*, pp.4 f.

[12] Smart, *ibid.*, p. 4.

[13] Cf. Robert C. Dentan, "The Nature and Function of Old Testament Theology," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, XIV (Feb., 1946), 20.

now who copied from whom? Or did both copy from some lost common source? If so, can we reconstruct and name it? What were the Israelites doing at this historical period, by the way? Is that reference to the Assyrians archeologically justifiable? Who were these Assyrians, incidentally, and what do we know about their culture and special superstitions? Could Isaias himself have known this much about them? Note, by the way, the artistry of his rhetoric, the skillful assyndeton and parrallelism here. He must have been an eloquent preacher! But in the flood of these manifold learned reflections (not, indeed, worthless or wholly unimportant), no mention even that this is the revealed Word of God, a divine teaching of direct bearing on our own lives today, a truth to live by, not merely to analyze in its setting. How clever, almost unnoticeable, the evasion of the real import of the scriptural passage![14]

When attention *was* paid to the religious content of a given portion of the Scriptures, it would be, most often, to the effect that after all the same idea occurs in Sumerian inscriptions and Accadian mythology, or in the tribal taboos of Indonesia, or is at least primitive, and so of no relevance to our advanced culture, even if seemingly original with the unknown Hebrew thinker traditionally, but uncritically, called Isaias. Similarly, the dogma of evolution, as applied, and over-applied, to the study of biblical teaching, assumed (in face of certain stubborn facts) that the process is always from an early primitive and rather crude concept of morals and religion to a higher and more refined level, which must necessarily be later chronologically and the result of merely natural forces of growth and imitation. Thus pre-Mosaic religion (of which we really know practically nothing) must "obviously" have been crudely totemistic and animistic, not to mention its anthropomorphic polytheism. If any elevated and profound religious concept is found in the so-called "Mosaic" books, it must consequently be considered a later insertion, for the ancient lawgiver could not have had ideas found more understandably in the great eighth-century Prophets. Similarly, no Psalm which has a lofty religious outlook dare be ascribed to pre-exilic times. Yet, as recent scholarship has begun to admit, a people's religious thought may progress downward under debasing circumstances, as well as upward, and Old Testament religion is unique in its purity and substantial unity from the beginning. And these are themselves historic facts, to be seen as such.[15]

---

[14] Cf. Wright, op. cit., pp. 1-4, whose points I here paraphrase and in some details expand with further examples.

These and similar principles are the features which have dominated practically all non-Catholic biblical scholarship for the past forty years. It is a purely secularized science, an "objective" study of the Bible as of any other ancient Semitic document, on the assumption that it is merely another interesting historical record, part fact, part myth and fiction, paralleling in nature, content, and spirit the newly-recovered religious and mythological documents of the ancient Near East. This phenomenon is termed Historicism, though its practitioners call it Biblical Studies!

THE REAWAKENING OF A MORE THEOLOGICAL IDEAL

Fortunately, a revulsion from the intrinsic religious barrenness of this myopic "historical" approach to the Sacred Scriptures seems to be setting in, and leading non-Catholic biblical scholars are currently much aware of the beginnings of a new trend. As Wright puts it, "There are premonitions that a new day is about to dawn. Among both biblical scholars and theologians there are those who are becoming increasingly uncomfortable with their former state. We have never been without voices crying in the wilderness, and today they are beginning to be heard."[16] Irwin echoes this observation: "Yet now again Old Testament theology is asserting itself as a valid part of the task of the Old Testament worker. . . . That contemporary religious thought has suffered by this lapse of Old Testament scholarship is evident. Equally it is apparent that our afflicted and confused age, so like the eighth century B.C., stands in utmost need of the sober truth and steadying faith which the Old Testament is ever ready to confer in bounty on him who can understand—and follow."[17] Craig notices the same re-orientation in the work of the latest New Testament scholars: "These men are not absorbed in the linguistic contributions of Hellenistic papyri, nor in the pursuit of

---

[15] For all this, cf. Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," pp. 7 f. and Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[16] Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

[17] Wm. A. Irwin, "Fifty Years of Old Testament Scholarship," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, X (Aug., 1942), 135, 183.

Aramaic originals for our canonical gospels, but with basic questions like the abiding meaning of the gospel."[18]

Underlying this rectification of approach is a growing sense of the inadequacy and fatal omissions of the previously prevailing method. Irwin puts the point quite frankly: "It is a common charge against Old Testament scholarship that it has no relevance for the theologian. Nor may we wonder at this. It would require a more than ordinary mental digestion to find sustenance in the broken pots of the biblical archeologist, the quibbles of the critic, the uncertainties of the historian, and the deadening results of much of our study of Israel's religion."[19]

Various reasons for this growing demand of a new approach to scriptural studies are given by the recent discussions of the current situation. Scholars are at last beginning to realize that the *Golden Bough* method of undiscriminating and misleading comparative religion techniques as applied to the Bible is really superficial and unscientific because of its leaving out of account the cardinal fact of the uniquely supernatural and authentic character of both Old and New Testament religion.[20] Wright accuses historicism of distorting Hebrew religion, not presenting it in a forthright and positive manner, not bringing out the *relevance* of its message for our own day.[21] Dentan insists that scriptural studies must become interested again in the significance of biblical teaching for modern theology, in the Bible's timeless values, its meaning as revelation, its importance for teaching, preaching, and as a source of inspiration for daily life, and charges that "the Old Testament scholar who is content to live in some linguistic or archaeological ivory tower, without considering the things with which he deals in the light of their significance for life and faith, is a curious anachronism . . . in this our age, which is hungering for the eternal truths of the Bible."[22] The Christian can no longer rest satisfied with drawing his inspiration from the New Testament alone, for "there is in the Old Testament much material of great value to the Christian life which is not duplicated in the New. The Psalms, Isaiah, Genesis, Job, etc. have always been a great treasury of Christian devotional literature."[23]

---

[18] Clarence T. Craig, "Biblical Theology and the Rise of Historicism," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXII (Dec., 1943), 292 f.

[19] Irwin, "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," p. 243.

[20] Cf. Norman H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 12 ff.

[21] Wright, *op. cit.*, p. v.

[22] "The Nature and Function of Old Testament Theology," p. 16.

Nor is the deepest and most valid motive for a better attitude passed over:

> It is not to be forgotten that the Bible is not a historical textbook, but a religious book, through which God speaks to men. Any understanding which misses this is inadequate and incomplete, and it is perilous to encourage men to read it for what it is not, instead of for what it is. The newer attitude to the Bible . . . perceives that no merely intellectual understanding of the Bible, however complete, can possess all its treasures. It does not despise such an understanding, for it is essential to a complete understanding. But it must lead to a spiritual understanding of the spiritual treasures of this Book if it is to become complete.[24]

> The Bible certainly is literature, some of it comparable in excellence by any tests with any other literature in the world, but its value for us does not lie here. It is the Word of God, and the Old Testament is an integral part of that Word.[25]

> The basic conviction behind this rebirth is that in the Old Testament there is something of primary importance for the Christian church which has persistently eluded the purely historical method and is in peril of becoming permanently lost unless the Old Testament is interpreted through some other mode of approach than the purely historical one. . . . by asking what significance the text may have as part of God's revelation to man, and dealing with it not as the record of ancient ideas (although in part it may be that) but as Holy Scripture, through which the man of the twentieth century may hear the very truth which he needs to hear and which even his wisest men are not able to speak to him.[26]

In a sense, then, modern scriptural study must "advance backwards"[27] yet retain all the new goods which have resulted from the intensive historical studies of the past two generations:

---

[23] Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[24] Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 18 f.

[25] Snaith, *op. cit.*, pp.14 f.; cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[26] Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," pp. 129, 133.

[27] Snaith, *op. cit.*, pp.14.

> The newer attitude does not reject the work of the earlier study, but seeks to conserve all that is of worth in the fruits of every approach. Yet it desires to transcend them. It accepts substantially the work of Biblical criticism, but beyond the desire to know the date and authorship of the books of the Bible and the meaning they had for their first readers, it seeks the abiding significance of the Bible, and in particular its significance for this generation. It recognizes all the human processes that went into the making of the Bible, without reducing it to the level of a merely human document, and it acknowledges that its scientific study, which is still valued and continued, is not enough. For the Bible is first and foremost a religious Book . . . primarily and fundamentally God's word to man, and through all its human processes of authorship and transmission there is a divine process. Its recognition is not new, indeed, but it is claiming a more central place in Biblical study, and it is this that constitutes the most significant change of recent years.[28]

These writers warn, however, that in so studying the Bible, the student must not read into the conclusions or system he antecedently desires by finding and choosing texts out of context to bolster his private opinions. It is wrong to go to it, not to be taught by it and find in it criticism of one's personal outlook or system, but simply to find illustrations of this point or that.[29] It is humanly impossible indeed to be absolutely objective and impersonal in approaching the Bible's message, but it is an ideal to be striven for.[30] Yet Irwin goes to the extreme in this matter, asserting that anyone, Jew, Christian, Moslem, or pagan, anyone with the necessary scholarly qualification is equipped to discuss Old Testament religion if only he brings to the task a humane sympathy with the men expressing in the various scriptural books their struggles with the problems of life![31] He bases this assertion on a sad misconception of the nature of Faith, which he argues (rightly, on his idea of the nature of faith) really can bring no new knowledge not strictly reducible to the rational knowledge gained by scientific analysis and humane sympathy with the writer.[32] By thus turning off for themselves the special supernatural light of Faith in reading the divine message, these scholars condemn themselves and their followers to missing that fulness of understanding and inspiration which is the very thing they seek to find in the Scriptures by this new approach.

---

[28] Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 f.

[29] Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. vii, 102.

[30] Irwin, "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," pp. 240 f.

[31] *ibid.*, pp. 241 f.

[32] Cf. his reasoning, *ibid.*, p. 241 and the long note 17 on p. 242.

VARIOUS CONCEPTIONS OF SCRIPTURAL THEOLOGY

As might be expected, these non-Catholic scholars now promoting a long-overdue return to a more theological study of the Bible differ widely among themselves as to the specific nature and procedure of this new biblical theology. Irwin, in 1942, openly confesses that "At present, no one seems to know just what Old Testament theology is: more specifically, what is its relation to a history of Israel's religion and how it is to employ the valid contributions of the history-of-religions approach."[33] By 1945, however, he is convinced that Old Testament theology is simply the scientific history-of-religions technique applied to Israel's belief, that "its objective is not to find authentication or support for Christian dogmas in Israel's literature, nor the more legitimate purpose of applying this literature to the needs of the present. . . . It is concerned purely and simply with telling in organized form what Israel believed."[34] He goes on to argue that since the vast range and complexity of both archeological-historical studies and of systematic theology are enough to fill a man's lifetime in either field alone, it is futile to desire to combine both in one scholarly career. Hence the only hope for developing a true biblical theology is for the archeologist-historian to present all the solid substance of his knowledge in readily assimilable form to the professional theologian, and let the latter combine it with speculative principles into an authentic scriptural theology. But though in order thus to discover and arrange his matter for theological intussusception the Old Testament historian must be trained in theology and keep abreast of its developments (that he may not miss in his analysis those aspects which mere history does not perceive), he must always be on his guard not to imagine himself a theologian.[35]

Burrows, however, conceives the nature of "biblical theology" to be bringing knowledge of the Scriptures and their riches into play for the practical needs of preaching and teaching. He sums up his view thus:

---

[33] Irwin, "Fifty Years of Old Testament Scholarship," pp. 135, 183.

[34] Irwin, "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," p. 244.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 243 ff.

> The resources of the Bible for preaching and teaching cannot be fully utilized unless somebody, somewhere along the line, picks out and brings together what belongs together from the point of its bearing on specific problems and needs. To facilitate a more adequate use of the spiritual resources of the Bible by making the results of biblical scholarship available in convenient form for religious work is what seems to me to be the important, urgent task of biblical theology.[36]

Filson argues that the essence of biblical theology is to bring out the basic, unifying ideas of the scriptural message, which he says will be found to center about these seven key doctrines: the working of God in history, the importance of the historical Jesus, the centrality of the Cross, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the power of God to meet men's needs, the Spirit-led Church as instrument of God's purpose, hope in the presence of the unknown.[37]

Rowley stresses the need of studying both Testaments in mutual relation:

> The Old Testament, itself so essential to the understanding of the New, can never be fully understood without the New. There is a theology of the Old Testament distinct from the theology of the New, yet the one cannot be properly understood without the other. It is unnecessary to read back the New Testament into the Old, or to obscure the differences between them, but it is necessary to recognize that the theology of the New Testament is rooted in the theology of the Old, while the theology of the Old Testament reaches its full fruition in that of the New.[38]

Craig points out that for the pioneers a century ago, "biblical theology was no longer to be a theology supported by biblical proof-texts, but the theology held by the biblical writers. 'What do the Scriptures teach?' and 'What is dogmatic truth?' became two different questions."[39] Irwin vigorously asserts that this concept must be maintained anew, lest the movement revert to "medievalism—in essence nothing but a revival of the search for Christian proof-texts in the Old Testament."[40]

---

[36] Millar Burrows, "The Task of Biblical Theology," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, XIV (Feb., 1946), 13 ff.; summary on p. 15.

[37] Floyd V. Filson, "A New Testament Student's Approach to Biblical Theology," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, XIV (Feb., 1946), 24 ff.

[38] Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 17. One is reminded of St. Augustine's principle: *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.*

For Dentan, biblical theology is simply dogmatic theology of the Scriptures, a systematic presentation of biblical teaching. He observes:

> As we study the theology of the Old Testament, we shall also deepen our theological understanding of the Old Testament, for when we finally come to know the God whom Israel loved and served in history we shall know that he is the same God whom we ourselves have loved and served and whose glory we have seen in the face of Jesus Christ. It is as we reach this point that we shall begin to see the *theological significance* of the Old Testament in its proper perspective, and it is, I am convinced, only as we approach the subject from this standpoint, that of the theology of the Old Testament itself, that we can achieve a *theological interpretation* of the Old Testament which will be something more than uncritical theologizing.[41]

But Craig protests that this dogmatic approach is all wrong: "I personally believe that the older historicism had run into bankruptcy. It tended to forget that after all it was an enterprise carried on for its human values. But the present revolt is in grave danger of becoming a retreat to dogma rather than an advance to a truer insight into the permanent significance of the events recorded in the Old and New Testaments."[42] He further proposes the startling (not to use a more deprecatory epithet) idea that New Testament theology should embrace early extra-canonical writings on the same footing as the New Testament itself:

> New Testament Theology deals with an artificial segment of Christian thought and life. . . . I Clement is surely as old as the Johannine writings, and the Shepherd of Hermas is certainly older than II Peter.[!] If New Testament Theology is to claim to be an historical discipline, how can it ignore books just because later centuries did not include

---

[39] Craig, "Biblical Theology and the Rise of Historicism," p. 281.

[40] Irwin, "The Reviving Theology of the Old Testament," p. 241.

[41] Dentan, "The Nature and Function of Old Testament Theology," pp. 20 f. Italics his.

[42] Craig, "Biblical Theology and the Rise of Historicism," p. 294.

> them in a reputedly apostolic list of writings? The very fact that books were rejected shows that the New Testament was not completely representative of those who called themselves Christians in the early centuries. The New Testament was written by those whom later Christians chose to recognize as their spiritual parents.[43]

This is rather far from the position of Wright, Rowley, and Snaith, which as we have seen above, assumes that the Bible, and it alone, is the inspired Word of God, no mere human religious document.

Finally, Wright brings in the basic Protestant principle that of course in studying the theology of the Bible one has, like Luther and Calvin, to determine by personal inner experience and decision in each instance whether or not a given passage is the very Word of God. This inner enlightenment

> gives no dogma about a mechanical or external authority of each section or every word or the whole Bible at once, but it rather focuses upon that one particular portion at a time which arrests us and convicts us of our sin. The real authority of the Bible lies in those moral and spiritual truths which reach the believer's heart. It is not those historical and scientific truths for which we have been given logical faculties—minds—to discern and prove.[44]

THE OLD IDEAS DIE HARD

Despite the extensiveness of the current return of non-Catholic biblical scholarship to a more spiritual and theological attitude in scriptural studies, it must not be assumed that the formerly prevailing and strongly entrenched historicism has given up without a struggle. That approach still lives on, and occasionally fights back vigorously. The most remarkable instance is perhaps the furious attack on the new direction in biblical studies made by Prof. Morton Enslin of Crozer Theological Seminary in his Presidential Address of December, 1945, at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

After stating that his title, "The Future of Biblical Studies" should rather be "Is there a Future for Biblical Studies?" in view of the collapse of German scholarship because of the chaos resulting from the recent war and in view of the signs that America is not producing giants of biblical scholarship to take over the work of the outgoing generation, Dr. Enslin bitterly denounces the further evil portent of a perversion of pure biblical studies to the bolstering of concrete religious belief:

---

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 287.

[44] Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.

> Precisely the same virus which has poisoned German scholarship in the last few years is in our blood, though perhaps in a somewhat different form: the incentive to make our findings practical and acceptable to the self-constituted leaders. It is easy to damn the perversion of German scholarship to the so-called Nazi ideology and point of view. I see a similar peril here, and it is even more forbidding and ominous because it appears so innocent and virtuous. It is the demand that our researches strengthen faith and provide blueprints for modern conduct.
>
> Repeatedly we have been told that we owe it to our students to aid them to a warm religious attitude to life, to a deeper and more satisfying faith; that we lay too great emphasis on the critical and analytical—I have heard it styled the minutiae—that we need a new and more positive technique; that we should realize that scholarly reserve and dispassionate appraisal are out of place in our field. We are dealing with "words of life," with materials of divine revelation, with materials vastly different from those in other disciplines. . . .
>
> To me this emphasis is utterly false and vicious. That many theological and biblical students might profitably be encouraged to be better men with more vital religious inclinations and less cant, I do not question. . . . As a historian of the New Testament, however, I do not consider it a whit more my task to temper the wind to shorn and mangy lambs or to distort my findings for fear of undermining stubborn credulity masquerading as simple babelike faith than it is the task of my colleagues in the chairs of mathematics or comparative anatomy in the near-by university.
>
> [We should] above all rid their minds utterly of the notion that the literature which they are examining is of a different sort from that under scrutiny by their brothers the classical students and Assyriologists; in short, encourage them to let their findings determine their feelings, not their feelings their findings; to keep their hands off the scales when weighing evidence, even if it concerns the validity of the faith of their fathers (or pastors); to make them realize that it is the one unforgivable sin against the deities of learning to make the one pan of the balance go down because they want it to go down, even if they are convinced that their own soul's salvation is hanging in the balance.[45]

That is not an altogether fair representation of his adversaries' real ideals in advocating a more theological approach in biblical studies, but it is certainly a clear indication of the historicist frame of mind and of its occupational disease: myopia (if not deliberate revulsion) to the distinctively divine and supernatural character of the Bible in contrast to all other books in the world. It shows what the new movement toward a rebirth of biblical theology in a more proper sense is up against.

---

[45] Morton S. Enslin, "The Future of Biblical Studies," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXV (March, 1946), 5ff.

THE SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE CHURCH OF THE REVIVAL OF SCRIPTURAL THEOLOGY

As will be obvious, the essence of the new slant of non-Catholic biblical studies toward a more theological interest and treatment is its recognition of the unique and timeless *religious significance* of the Holy Scriptures. This is nothing new or currently forgotten in Catholic biblical studies, for the Church has never faltered in its reverence for the Scriptures as the very Word of God and a precious receptacle of His merciful revelation for our instruction, strengthening, and religious vitality. Indeed, the new movement in scripture studies outside the Church generally falls short of our own divinely founded understanding of the importance and true function of biblical studies.

Any Catholic, too, will agree with Prat's typical Catholic definition of biblical theology as that branch of positive theology which seeks to make an inventory of the theological doctrine contained in the Sacred Scriptures by collecting the results of soundly scientific exegesis, bringing them together for comparison, assigning their place in the history of revelation and its development, and present this ordered synthesis of biblical doctrine to scholastic theology as a sure foundation of properly assimilable materials for working up, with the aid of its own technique of rational deduction, into the vast unified synthesis and system of total Catholic truth.[46]

To a Catholic, of course, biblical theology as thus conceived cannot be looked on as the whole of theology, leaving no room for dogmatic theology as such, which builds on both it and on divine truths known from extra-biblical sources—tradition as operative in the Fathers, Councils, and living *magisterium* of the Church.

---

[46] Fernand Prat, S. J., *The Theology of St. Paul*, transl. John L. Stoddard (New York: Benziger Bros., 1926. Two vols.), I, 1.

Nor can scriptural theology claim absolute autonomy from these other truths or the general position of the infallible teaching authority of the Church.[47] Its sources, however, are themselves divine, being exclusively the canonical books of the Bible regarded not as mere human documents on a footing with other records of ancient religious thought but as the inspired revelation and authoritative unerring teaching of God Himself.[48]

We Catholics, then, have no difficulty with the theory of scriptural theology or its importance and specific role. But we could well pay more heed to its practice.

It must be admitted that Catholic scholarship has not so far produced a satisfactory amount of high-level scriptural theology in its proper sense. The dearth is not only conspicuous; it is shameful. This situation represents a real loss, or at least a retardation of progress, for Catholic theology in the large. Prat's magnificent *Theology of St. Paul* is, indeed, a masterpiece, a clear and splendid object-lesson in what Catholic biblical theology can be and mean. But it is almost without company in its glory. How long must this condition endure? When are we going to make up for this notable failure on our part? Here is a definite opening for constructive work, a call to progress in the immediate future.

Part of the solution, no doubt—and a special aspect of the larger problem—lies in giving our seminary courses in Scripture a more theological character. That is, there should be adequate emphasis on synthesis of the vital principles and message of scriptural books individually and together. This presupposes an antecedent analysis, by way of exegesis and close study, of at least the major books, and at minimum a careful reading of substantially the whole Bible. Only thus will the future priest and scholar experience the full impact of the sacred writings, be vitalized in his own mind and life by the special dynamism of the scriptural message.

This does not mean that there must be an explicit set course in biblical theology as such, though that, or at least a sample of it (say, in one book such as St. John, Isaias, or the Psalms), would be a most appropriate seminary activity. But it does mean that over and above working through the main body of the Scriptures—and not merely a small portion of them—in a careful analytic fashion in the light of relevant historical and literary principles and techniques, the student must come to an organized theological understanding of scriptural doctrine seen in a unified synthesis where its bearing on thought and life may become both evident and of ready application. In this way alone will the Bible's divine beauty and force and sacred influence on the individual soul accomplish in priests of the Church its intended work, and the Scriptures become for them that "pure and never-failing source for their own spiritual life, as well as food and strength for their sacred office of preaching" which Pius XII sets down as an essential part of priestly training in his admirable encyclical on the promotion of biblical studies, *Divino afflante Spiritu*.[49]

---

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Mere scattered knowledge of uprooted scripture texts found as proofs in dogmatic treatises is not sufficient acquaintance for the theologian with the great message and special religious spirit of the Bible. It is imperative that the divine teaching be studied in the large and as a unit, according to its own inspired scheme, arrangement, and manner of presentation. For the Bible has its own way of setting forth religious truths, its own unique features as an expression of our religion. These peculiarly biblical factors, so different in many ways from scientifically systematized scholastic methodology, must have their essential place in any complete theological synthesis and quite definitely in that general theological training which the Church rightly demands of her priests.

Unless this biblical element is operative as a basic and continuous ingredient of the priestly mind, there is real danger of falling into an overly speculative bias which makes of religious truth merely something to study and categorize and distinguish on, rather than to relish and live. Or from this same unbalanced training the very opposite may eventually develop by way of revulsion and disillusionment—an abandoning and practical rejection of all speculative interests in religious doctrine, which normally implies abandoning much of the doctrine too, by neglecting its inner precision and richness, and substituting a "practical, work-a-day" attitude toward religion and its teaching to the people for a living theological fullness, thereby confusing the Faith with external works.

It is a special virtue of the Scriptures (and herein lies the basic importance of biblical theology) that they impress upon us a most vivid, vital, and humanly moving *realization* of the great religious truths. They force us to see divine realities in their stark imperiousness and direct personal applications. They drive supernatural truths home to the very hiding of the soul, and present them in a concrete authoritative way which admits of no evasion, side-tracking, or bored unconcern such as often befalls the best of human reasonings. "For the Word of God is a living and power-packed message, sharper than any double-edged sword, cutting its way through soul and spirit, joints and marrow, discriminating and judging the thoughts and intentions of the heart."[50]

---

[49] Sections 54-55 in the N.C.W.C. edition (Washington, 1943), p. 24.

Because the Sacred Scriptures are in essence a self-portrait of God, designed expressly to affect the human mind and heart by Him who made man and knows what is in him and who also wrote these books, it is not surprising that they have a unique efficacy for conveying a living personalized knowledge of the great divine truths they teach. This striking vitality of biblical religion is a precious factor to be capitalized on to the full in priestly training and ministry. The Scriptures always present a humanly interesting *practical* concept of religion as something to be lived, not merely known. Their study constitutes not so much an abstract science as a sublimation of the individual's own life. What they emphasize is an unceasing personal awareness of the actuality of God's constant action on ourselves, in nature, and in history. Their aim is to implant a perpetual concern with the eternal issues, a practical consciousness of the supernatural world as the prime reality, an interest in and understanding of God's ways with men and their response to Him.

By their humanized approach and great literary art, the Scriptures succeed in informing religious truths with a remarkable vividness and actuality. The Bible's concrete, even startling, realism cannot but make God and the things of God come to life for the attentive student and take their place among the great realities impinging on man's thought and conduct. God is no abstraction in the Bible. He remains, indeed, pure act and subsistent increate Being, but He passes beyond that merely metaphysical view into a movingly personal concept in the scriptural picture, with a more direct appeal to one's total religious sensitivity. Similarly, good and evil and the fact of God's power and providence are so luminously real in the biblical account that they become almost tangible.

---

[50] *Hebr.* 4:12 (cf. the Greek).

The importance of such a background in the doctrine and viewpoint and *informing spirit* of the Scriptures for the priest who is ordained to carry on the work of the Prophets and Apostles will be denied by no one—except, too often, in practice by failing to emphasize adequately this part of a priest's training and continued study. Though biblical theology, the study of the Faith as presented in the Scriptures themselves, is nothing strange to Catholic priests and priests-to-be, it must be admitted that it often does not hold a sufficiently operative place in our studies and writing. Besides formal dogmatic theology, and in fruitful conjunction with it, there should be enough emphasis (and in many cases that means more emphasis than at present) on direct study of the Bible in itself and according to its own special function and spirit. This will bring the modern priest something of that added illumination of the mind with divine truth and that steady inner fire of apostolic zeal which the disciples of Emmaus experienced when their hearts burned within them as they saw in unified clarity the meaning and applicability of the Scriptures. By thus attending to the inspired writings, "as to a light that shines in a dark place, until the day dawns and the day-star arises in our hearts,"[51] the priest will come to an actual understanding that in truth "every Scripture inspired by God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, fitted out for every good work."[52] Surely such a study deserves to be promoted to the full.

The fact that non-Catholic scripture scholars are beginning at last to see the bitter fruits, the barrenness, the disastrous inadequacy of a merely naturalistic and historical approach to the Bible and are turning of late to a re-emphasis of its spiritual value and significance may well serve to remind us Catholics what a treasure of vital religious truth the Scriptures can open to us if only we search properly in their riches. By making our Scripture studies not merely a running historical commentary and philological exegesis of the text, but also in a definite way an orderly opening out of the great *message* and *thought* of the Bible in its individual facets and the unified general pattern, we can pave the way to a rebirth of scriptural theology in Catholic circles too, where it will have fuller meaning and still richer fruits. Thereby we can turn to our own great profit this lesson learned by the "Egyptians" from their sorrows and error, as we have already long been enriched by the spoils of their energetic labors in scriptural history and archeology.

---

[51] *II Peter* 1:19-20.

[52] *II Tim.* 3:15-17.

Such a rebirth, or rather intensification, on our part in studying the theology of the Bible will manifest itself in an increased dexterity with that "sword of the Spirit, the Word of God"[53] which is an essential part of our equipment in the battle for God and His Kingdom. It will further manifest itself, we may hope, in a more fruitful production—to the good of the Church—of needed vital works in biblical theology as such. That we can do this, Prat's example clearly proves, as also this quotation from one of the recent non-Catholic articles on the question at issue:

> The greatest practical need of Old Testament scholarship today in the English speaking world, at least for those who are primarily engaged in teaching, is an adequate book on Old Testament theology. . . . If one seeks a model for such a work, the most satisfactory which has yet appeared is the *Theologie des Alten Testaments* of Paul Heinisch, a Roman Catholic work published at Bonn in 1940. . . . It is an excellent type of what such a book should be—broadly and simply organized, exhaustive in its scheme of documentation, lucid in its style, and critical in its judgment.[54]

Our opportunity in this matter, indeed our duty, is clear. We may hope that Catholic scholarship will rise to the occasion, carrying out (and fostering in others) that gloriously Catholic cry of St. Augustine: *Studia mea flammantia vehementer in Scripturas tuas. . . . Intellegam eas, Pater bone!*[55]

RAYMOND V. SCHODER. S. J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Ind.

---

[53] *Eph.* 6:17.

[54] Dentan, "The Nature and Function of Old Testament Theology," pp. 20 f. Significantly, this is the only reference in all these numerous articles and books to any Catholic work in biblical theology. Prat is never even considered. Can it be that the professedly objective and undogmatic ideals of these scholars fail to extend to even looking into Catholic books, however competent, on the subjects being studied, whereas leading Catholic scholars are up-to-date on all important work by outside writers? Or is it simply that Catholic biblical scholarship's voice in these fields is too weak from lack of volume to be attended to?

[55] *Conf.* 11, 22; 13, 15.

THE PROBLEM OF ST. JEROME

In keeping with the career of the man himself, the biography of St. Jerome is studded with controversy. Scholars and writers of the Renaissance and of the Reformation—from Luther and Erasmus to Cave and Basnagius—indulged in the most vitriolic of polemics when discussing Jerome, for the most part exaggeratedly praising or damning each other along with the subject of their labors. In the nineteenth century, in similar fashion, opinion favoring Jerome or belittling him ran in full current. One has to go back to Lenain de Tillemont in the eighteenth century to find a calm, judicious and tempered estimate of the man, and of the problems connected with the investigation of his career.[1]

Echoes of such battling come right down to our own times. The life of Jerome is an admittedly hard thing to delineate. The chronology of his career, for example, the date and place of his birth, the technique and full extent of his scriptural labors, are all matters about which we have few absolute certainties. Yet we do know a great deal about the man. We are well acquainted with many of the intimate details entering into the make-up and personality of this great saint and doctor of the Church—the methods and some of the difficulties of his indefatigable scholarship; his close friendships and abiding enmities.

We know likewise that he helped shape the mind and heart of Christendom during his own age and the schooling of Christian men and women for well over a thousand years. Hence it is worth while discussing the details of his life, the content of his Scriptural canon, the irascibility or the piety that motivated his scholarly duellings, and the moral worth of his friends and enemies.

It is regrettable that there is no competent, full-sized biography of Jerome in English. It is likewise unfortunate that in preparing his essay on Jerome for the Feb., 1947, *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Fr. F. Moriarty, S.J., did not make use of the definitive life of the Saint written in 1922 by his fellow Jesuit, the renowned patrologist and scholar, Ferdinand Cavallera: *St. Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre.*

According to Fr. Cavallera, St. Jerome was born, in all probability, in 347—a fact that incidentally makes this the centenary of his birth. The argumentation in favor of this date is a trifle complicated. But it has been accepted by most modern historians and patrologists as at least a workable date. Thus Paul Monceaux in his rather charming *St. Jérôme; sa jeunesse*, translated into English by Frank Sheed as *St. Jérôme, the Early Years* (Sheed and Ward, 1933), accepts 347 as the most likely date, while calling attention to the fact that thereby is thrown out at one fell swoop the tradition, based on Prosper of Aquitaine, that Jerome first saw the light of day in 331, and therefore lived on into extreme old age. Cayré, Steidle, and Altaner[2] are likewise inclined to concur in Cavallera's judgment of the matter.

---

[1] L. de Tillemont, "St. Jérôme, Abbé solitaire, etc.," in *Mémoires pour servir a l'Histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siécles*, t. XII (Paris), 1709.

Jerome himself informs us that at the time of the Emperor Julian's death in June, 363, he was still a pupil in a grammarian's school in Rome. We know that according to the normal cycle of studies, Roman boys entered the grammar school at twelve, leaving it at sixteen to follow courses in rhetoric, philosophy, and law. Boys from the provinces, moreover, had to be out of Rome by their twentieth birthday, whether they considered their education finished or not. Augustine's experience and testimony is proof-positive of this procedure; and we have the law itself in the Theodosian code.[3]

Hence treating Jerome as a normal student, which he undoubtedly was, and knowing in June of 363 he was not yet sixteen, the earliest date for his birth is 347. This hypothesis is well substantiated by a judicious analysis of Jerome's autobiographical references to himself as *puer*, *juvenis*, *adolescens*, and *senex*, taking into account his normal propensity for rhetorical exaggeration. It does not fit in with legend. Nor does it fit very well with his constant reference to St. Augustine as a young man, in their correspondence; and the latter's deference to Jerome as to one greatly his senior. But the two men never saw each other; and though there was but seven years between them, Jerome is close to fifty when he first contacts Augustine (*circa* 395), and is constantly referring to himself as already bowed down with the years.

---

[2] A. Cayré, *Precis de patrologie* (2 vols., Paris, 1931-33), vol. I; B. Steidle, *Patrologia* (Freiburg-in-Briesgau, 1937); B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (F.-in-B., 1938), p. 251.

[3] Cf. P. Monceaux and F. Sheed, *St. Jerome* (English translation, Sheed and Ward, 1933), pp 4 f.

Augustine, in the prime of his life, and feeling himself a fairly youthful bishop, takes Jerome at his word.

As for Jerome's origin, much ink together with a not inconsiderable amount of irascibility has been expended in contentions that would nationalize him as an Istrian, Slav, Bohemian, and even as a Spaniard; whereas, quite simply, he was an Italian, born, as he himself tells us, "in the town of Stridon, which has since been destroyed by the Goths, but which was located on the *confinium* of Dalmatia and Pannonia."[4]

Here again Fr. Cavallera serves us with a remarkable bit of scholarship in pointing out that this *confinium* is really a neck of land thrust between the frontiers of the two provinces.[5] Jerome's Stridon, then, was an outlying part of the province of Venetia-Histria, formerly the tenth region of Italy, wedged in between Dalmatia and Pannonia, close by the towns of Hemona and Aquileia.

Peculiarly enough, as recently as last year, Cavallera had to defend his position, which had been attacked with no little vehemence by Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B. The discussion is characteristic, in a way, of controversies revolving around Jerome, and is thus worthy of narration.

As early as 1898, Msgr. Bulic had made a claim for Grahovo in Bosnia as the birth-place of Jerome, based upon his reading and interpretation of an inscription that was alleged to have been found in that region around 1882. Unfortunately, no trace can be found of the inscription itself; the copy is hardly intelligible; and the actual deciphering is largely a matter of pure guesswork.[6] Hence Cavallera, along with a number of competent archeologists including Theodore Mommsen, have disallowed it as evidence; and have turned to a scientific analysis of the date Jerome himself supplies, coming to the satisfactory solution recorded above.

---

[4] Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 135.

[5] F. Cavallera, *St. Jérôme*, II, 67-71. See the map on p. 363 of A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'eglise*, III (Paris, 1936).

[6] The original inscription is supposed to read:

FIVISIVIERSALV
IAIASEISIPIDO
VEVSESOEIEPM
IVAVIT

Msgr. Bulic transliterates as:

FINES INTER SALV
IATAS ET STRIDO
NENSES DETERM
INAVIT

Cf. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, II, 68.

However, in 1924, Dom Morin contributed an article to the *Strena buliciana* in which he accepted Msgr. Bulic's thesis, inscription and all. Then two years later, in the *Revue Benedictine*, he back-tracked, repudiating the story of the inscription as most probably a hoax. In 1941, however, in *Nova et vetera*, he suddenly came out with an article attacking both Fathers Cavallera and Vaccari—the latter a Scripture scholar of no mean competence and a redoubtable devotee of Hieronymian scholarship—denouncing them for allowing nationalistic considerations to color their reasoning about the question. Surprised and apparently hurt, Fr. Cavallera answered with a note in the *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*,[7] in which he went over the whole argument once more, giving conclusive reasons for rejecting the inscription and reaffirming his original position.

The history of the estimate of Jerome's character, personality and controversial spirit is of a similar nature. The early Protestants pounced upon him for his unrelenting polemic, as well as for his exact Catholicity in the matter of the virginity of the Mother of God, the cult of relics and the practice of bodily mortification; but above all for his having so explicitly championed the primacy of the papacy at Rome. On the other hand, many of his Catholic apologists have tried to deny or at least cover up—usually at the expense of some innocent third party—his exaggerative and vituperative characteristics.

That he was irascible, that he made enemies, that he flayed innocent people as well as heretics is unfortunate. It need not however be taken as an indication that the man was not a saint. He was a very strong-minded individual, given to the exaggerations of the literary tradition in which he was educated. But at the time he was a relentless ascetic, who practiced mortification incessantly; who lived in the realm of the supernatural, and helped to form a truly Christian mind in hundreds of his friends and followers.

It was a Renaissance pope who, seeing one of the numerous paintings of Jerome in which he is portrayed as an almost cadaverous ascetic beating his breast with a rock, remarked: "Ah Jerome! and had you not been discovered in that attitude, you would not be on the altars of the Church today!" But the point of the matter is that he was discovered in that attitude. It is quite evident that the contemplative life to which he gave himself so assiduously for well over forty years well compensated for his faults, however numerous they may have been.

---

[7] "La patrie de saint Jérôme," (Jan.-March, 1946), pp. 60 ff.

As for Jerome's main scholarly preoccupation—the translation and exposition of the Sacred Scriptures—the magnitude of the service he did the Church in the West, and incidently the whole of Christendom, grows apace with the years. The pain and trouble it cost him simply cannot be exaggerated; and, in particular, the perseverence in one so sensitive, despite the ill reception of his work by men like Augustine, does credit to his tenacity of purpose and to his scholarly foresight.

Even though today we feel the need of getting back behind Jerome's Vulgate—modern scholarship has at last reached a point where it feels it can chance such a step—and even though Jerome himself might at first grumble at such questioning of his competence in handling the *hebraica veritas*, he would still appreciate the effort as an acknowledgement of the correctness of his own approach.[8] What must not be forgotten in assaying Jerome's life and works is the fact that he did take a very positive approach to one main problem of Christian endeavor—the leading of a supernatural life. Jerome's full attention was centered on the achievement of a unity with his Maker, and despite the daily distraction of his literary foibles—his Horace and Virgil and Cicero, whom as Rufinus tells us, "he puffed like smoke before his readers eyes"[9]—despite the magnitude of his Scriptural labors and the interminable number of his advice-giving letters, he did achieve a highly ascetic state of soul which is constantly revealing itself in everything he says and writes. It is a realistic sanctity bound into his personality.

There is a problem with regard to the date of Jerome's death—Cavallera resorting to the findings of the Bollandist Stiltung and placing it in 419, while Vaccari and most of the modern authors adhere to the more traditional 420. His bones, first deposited in the grotto at Bethlehem, are now supposed to repose beneath the altar in St. Mary Major's in Rome. There is no problem, however, as to the vividness with which he affected the imagination of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance. Nor is there any question of the effect his memory and inspiration have had on the pursuit in Scriptural studies in our own day.

---

[8] Cf. J. Voste, "The Vulgate at the Council of Trent," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, IX (1947), 23.

[9] Rufinus, *Apologia*, II, 6-7 (*M Pl*, XXI, 588).

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

Mt. St. Alphonsus,
Esopus, N. Y.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the August, 1897, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* the leading article, entitled "The New Theory of Crime and Justice," is contributed by Dr. William Barry, an English priest. It is a lengthy comment on the ideas expressed shortly before by Cesare Lombroso, according to whom the criminal is not a guilty person but rather an invalid, and crime is an inevitable ingredient of the social system. . . . Under the heading "Student Life in Rome," an interesting account of the daily life of the seminarians at the North American College in the Eternal City is given by an anoynymous writer who styles himself "Quirinus, D.D." . . . . Fr. William Poland, S.J., writing on "Methods of Modern Materialism," complains thus of the current educational methods: "Youths, girls, children, young men at higher schools and lower schools, at colleges and schools of medicine, are placed by fond fathers and mothers in the hands of materialistic professors, and they are mute in ignorance for an answer when challenged at the start as to the very existence of a spiritual soul distinct from matter." . . . An article on "The Transfiguration of Our Lord" is contributed by Alfred Loisy (who a few years later became a renegade from the Catholic Church). . . . Fr. Michael Lavelle, of New York, writes on "The Relations of the Pastor to the Sunday School," recommending that a small salary be given to Sunday-school teachers, when this is necessary to secure efficient service. . . . In the *Analecta* appears a decision of the Inquisition, given March 24, 1897, condemning the use of artificial fecundation. There are also several responses given to priests who doubted the validity of their ordination on the grounds that they had not sufficiently touched the instruments. In every case the answer was: "Orator acquiescat."

F. J. C.

NEW POLICY FOR THE CHURCH IN CHINA?

Americans are now well informed about the organization of the Catholic Hierarchy in China. Ninety-nine of the one hundred and thirty-seven territories into which China was divided for purposes of Church administration have been raised to the rank of diocese or archdiocese (twenty are archdioceses), and China has received its first Cardinal. To some this may have seemed like an evidence of a sudden change in the policy of the Church, but in fact the appointment of a Chinese Cardinal and of the new archbishops and bishops is but the culmination of a long-established policy.

Twelve years after the death of John of Montecorvino, the first Archbishop of Peiping, another Franciscan, John of Marignolli, arrived in China as Papal Legate. However, he did not stay long, for uprisings had already broken out everywhere in revolt against the then ruling and tyrannical Mongol regime. In a letter explaining his departure from China, Fr. Marignolli wrote: "When the Emperor saw that nothing would induce me to abide there, he gave me leave to return to the Pope . . . with the request that I or someone else should be sent speedily back with the rank of Cardinal, and with full powers to be Bishop there, for the office of Bishops is highly venerated by all the Orientals whether they be Christians or not."

The downfall of the Yuan (Mongol) dynasty in 1368 precipitated the departure of all Catholic missionaries from the Chinese Empire and prevented the Holy See from giving satisfaction to the request of the Chinese Emperor. For a period of two hundred years the numerous Chinese families that had been received into the Church by Montecorvino and his missionaries were left without a single pastor. As a result, most members of these families became Buddhists and Mohammedans, or simply returned to paganism. The few who remained faithful to Christianity found themselves in a most pitiful state. Fr. Longobardi, the successor to the famous Fr. Ricci, wrote of these Christians in 1619: "Below the Moslems and even the Jews, the Christians, called 'Worshippers of the Cross,' are held in low esteem because, in former days, they helped the Tatars against the Chinese and are [now being] persecuted by the Moslems for their devotion to the Cross."

It was evident from this early experience that without Chinese clergy the Church could never have a firm foothold on Chinese soil. Father Ricci and the other Jesuits who were associated with him in the China missions were the first to realize the Church's precarious situation in that country. Shortly after Ricci's death in 1610 the Jesuits petitioned Pope Paul V to grant China a Chinese Liturgy, in order to facilitate the formation of a native clergy. In 1615 the Pope authorized the translation of the Bible into Chinese and the use of the Chinese language for Mass, the Breviary, and the administration of the sacraments.

These special privileges, however, were never put into effect. Nevertheless, the Holy See, far from abandoning the fundamental consideration of native clergy, prepared the way for a definite solution of the problem with the creation, in 1622, of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide. There are innumerable documents in which the Holy See urged the formation of a Chinese clergy and the establishment of a Chinese Hierarchy. Popes Alexander VII (1659), Clement IX (1669), and Clement X (1673) declared that the Vicars Apostolic who were sent to China went there with this particular purpose in view, to establish a native clergy. And the Holy See has never departed from this basic principle in spite of difficulties which have sometimes seemed insurmountable.

The early Portuguese missionaries in China, always mindful of their dependence upon their King and their government, opposed the idea of a Chinese clergy. They could not bring themselves to believe that the Chinese could produce men "suitable for sacerdotal duties." Even those who shared Rome's established policy were not always too eager to carry it into execution. Bishop Pally, one of the founders of the Paris Foreign Mission Society, while favoring the immediate consecration of Chinese bishops, suggested that they should be put under the supervision of European metropolitans. Bishop de Martillat, Apostolic Vicar of Chengtu, held similar views, as he proved when, being obliged to flee from Szechwan province in order to escape persecution, he turned the administration of the mission over to a Chinese priest, Fr. Andrew Ly, a zealous, capable, pious, and learned man, but at the same time appointed as procurator a European priest at far-away Macao as supervisor.

In answer to Bishop Pally's proposal, the Holy See answered that native priests should take full responsibility for the Church in China, and the Pope subsequently appointed a Chinese Dominican, Fr. Gregory Lo (Lo Wen-tsao), Vicar Apostolic of Nanking, with jurisdiction over the provinces of Chihli (now Hopeh), Shansi, Honan, and Shansi, as well as the whole extent of Korea (January, 1674).

Almost at the same time that Bishop de Martillat left his mission of Chengtu, a brilliant Chinese, Fr. Vital Kuo, was ordained by the Archbishop of Naples and, in a letter addressed to Fr. Andrew Ly, it was stated that the newly ordained priest had been chosen (by Pope Benedict XIV) to serve as archbishop in the province of Szechwan. Fr. Kuo then returned to China, as Fr. Ly testifies in his invaluable "*Diarium*," but he did not assume his duties as Archbishop of Chengtu. History fails to explain why, as it also fails to explain why Bishop Gregory Lo, who had received instructions to appoint a Chinese successor to himself, chose an Italian priest instead.

From the death of Bishop Lo in 1689 to the consecration of six Chinese bishops by Pope Pius XI in 1926, China did not have a single native bishop. Yet by 1900, the year of the Boxer Uprising, there were no less than five hundred Chinese priests, secular and regular. And, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, many a member of the Chinese clergy suffered persecution for the defense of the Faith. Four of these priests were martyrs and were beatified by Pope Leo XIII. They were Fathers Augustine Chao, Thaddeus Liu, Paul Yuan, and Joseph Yuan.

The blame for the failure to establish a native Hierarchy in China earlier cannot be placed upon the foreign missionaries alone—in fact, they did all they could to promote the establishment of a native clergy, as the presence of so many Chinese priests in the early 1900's gives proof. The difficulties with which the Holy See was confronted were due, indirectly at least, to the interference of secular powers. The stands taken by the early Portuguese missionaries, for example, was obviously dictated by the government of their country, which, at that time, enjoyed the privilege of protecting the Catholic Church in "pagan territories." This privilege was turned over to France during the reign of Louis XIV. It would be out of place to discuss here the controversy over the question of protectorates. It is not without interest, however, to note one fact out of many others. In his beautiful "*Souvenirs et pensées*" (Bruges, Belgium, 1945), the Rt. Rev. Peter-Celestine Lou Tseng-tsiang, O.S.B., mentions in passing an historic agreement between the Vatican and the Chinese government, of which he was then the Foreign Minister. Through the good offices of Dr. Lou, it was decided in 1918 that the Chinese government would send an amabassador to the Vatican in exchange for a nuncio for Peking (now Peiping). The Chinese ambassador was actually nominated, but before he could assume his duties, the agreement had to be rescinded, following a representation from the French government.

It was the last time that the Holy See took secular interference in Church affairs into consideration. By the appointment of Archbishop Celso Costantini as first Apostolic Delegate to China, the Church showed to the world that she was well able to take care of herself in affairs of this kind. The presence in China of a Chinese Cardinal and of Chinese archbishops and bishops gives proof of the Church's intention, long proclaimed by the Holy See, to trust the government of the Church to native sons as soon as these can be trained for the office of the priesthood.

THADDEUS YANG, O.S.B.

Chengtu (*Szechwan Province*), *China.*

THE VICAR OF CHRIST AND THE WORLD

There is one man on the face of the earth whose words when he speaks reach from sunrise to sunset; there is one man who is the most loved of all men, who is the centre of more hearts than any other among men. That man is the Vicar of Jesus Christ. So also there is one man who is the most hated of all men. No man on the face of the earth has conspiring against him a more ardent and a more concentrated hatred than the head of the Christian Church. The whole crowd of anti-Christian sects, of men that have apostatised from their faith, that have drowned themselves in the perdition of sin, all of them alike regard with an intense animosity the person who most nearly represents the Divine Lord of all. And I may add that therefore there is no man whose word causes throughout the world so great an agitation.

—Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, in "The Independence of the Holy See," published in his *Miscellanies* (New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1877), p. 850.

ON TEACHING THE BIBLE

No one man and no one generation possess the genius and the commensurate experience to interpret completely and absolutely the experience of humanity. The full sweep of this experience must come from all humanity, not from any one segment of it, no matter what its excellence. But where is humanity's interpretation of itself to be found save in art, philosophy, religion and letters, humanity's heritage to itself? It is by sharing in these that a man can in some degree come to the interpretation of human experience and to a perception of the meaning and purpose of life. This is the problem of the liberal education. For the believer, this whole affair is secondary and complementary. To God, the origin, process, and term of human history are completely and absolutely known, and through the Incarnate God they are known to us by revelation to the degree necessary. For in reality, Christianity is God's interpretation of human destiny through Christ. It is *the* interpretation, definitive and final. Education in revealed religion is therefore paramount. It is the greatest of the humanities since Christ's truth is the greatest humanizing force because divine; it is the noblest of the liberals arts, because it begets the freedom of the sons of God.

Obviously my competency in this matter is conditioned by my experience. There are two phases to my experience: instruction in the post-college level of maturity in the formal Scripture course of the Seminary, and the less formal lectures to adult groups. My purpose in this article is defined by my competency. Negatively put, I do not propose to discuss the pedagogic aspects of Bible teaching in the grade school, high school, and college levels; positively put, my objective is to contribute something that may be of service to instructors in these levels. They in turn by their competency may perhaps convert these things into a constructive force at the indicated levels.

THE PROBLEM

I view the problem then from the viewpoint of the teacher rather than from the viewpoint of the student. From this viewpoint I see the problem thus:

(1) The Bible teacher must teach a book or, more accurately,

a library of books, whose period of composition covers a span of more than a thousand years, whose term of composition was almost two thousand years ago, whose place of composition is removed by some five thousand miles from the place of instruction, whose original languages—Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek—are philologically remote from English. Furthermore, these books have been the storm center of most vehement religious controversy, the inspiration of the noblest art, the paragon of most excellent literature, the inspiration of most eminent sanctity, and the source of most arrogant doctrinal folly. The Bible therefore is to us both remote and proximate: remote in time, place, language, history, and culture; proximate in translation, worship, and devotion. The task of the teacher is to bridge the gap between the remote and the proximate; education must make the remote and unfamiliar proximate and familiar. Much of the wisdom of the Scripture is locked up in distant and strange rite or custom. Knowledge of antiquity is the key to that wisdom. The books can only truly contribute to education when they are truly known.

(2) The Bible teacher must know the Book he is teaching, not only books about it. This knowledge comes from reading the Bible intelligently. Here we encounter practical handicaps. The Douay Old Testament is highly unsatisfactory as an edition from the viewpoint of format, style, and accuracy of expression. The teacher therefore works with an imperfect instrument; this cannot be over-exaggerated. In the New Testament, teacher and reader are more fortunate. The recent translations are excellent instruments for reading and teaching; they are the Confraternity Edition, Monsignor Knox's translation, Fr. Spencer's translation from the Greek, and the Westminster version, also from the Greek (the first two are from the Latin Vulgate). The Old Testament is being translated from the original languages by members of the Catholical Biblical Association of America, and within a year or two the first sections of it should appear. This will be of incalculable service to teachers of the Old Testament, having as it will have, the advantages of modern format, editing, and biblical scholarship.

(3) The third handicap is the paucity of materials in English, particularly on the Old Testament. I refer to works of popular design and technique based upon the best biblical research. The sort of thing I mean is seen in the recent series of Scripture Text

Books for Catholic Schools done in England under the general editorship of Msgr. Barton. These materials are beginning to trickle in, but there is still much to be done. There is, for example, no recent History of Israel in English by a Catholic author. This is a shocking lack. We may look forward, fortunately, to the forthcoming English translation of Fr. Ricciotti's excellent work in Italian.

These things are said by way of appraisal, not by way of criticism. It is mere common sense to assay the problem before you endeavor to solve it. The difficulties I have drawn above may be grave for the educator, but it is decidedly more grave for the educator not to be aware of the handicaps and to plunge blithely into academic fields where angels fear to tread.

THE OBJECTIVE

What does a Bible course hope to achieve? The Bible can bring the students into personal contact with the revealed religious traditions of the world. There they meet the reality of God's dealing with men in the Jewish and Christian, the Old and New Economies. They meet the persons and places that were the avenues of revelation. They meet ideas not in the dull abstract, but in the dramatic concrete; not only do they hear penitence defined, they see it dramatized in David. They must come first to information and then to value-judgments. The former they may get without teaching aid, but rarely the second. Significance or value is perceived only by mature insight, and must be strongly emphasized by the teacher if the student is to get it. This personal experience of sharing in the great religious tradition is the essence of liberal education and, more important, the bulwark of faith. This is not the whole of liberal education, for there remain the arts, philosophy, letters, and science; but it is the cornerstone of Catholic Education and the principle of unity.

At the earliest possible time the student should be brought to the Bible itself, first by selected readings from it according to maturity levels, and ultimately the reading of the book itself. The current trend of reading the great books instead of reading mediocre books about them throws light on our problem. We are teaching the greatest book. Sound pedagogy may demand that in the beginning the child begin with paraphrases of the Bible, but as soon as pedagogically feasible the student should be led to the book. The ultimate objective is to awaken in him a love and devotion to the book. The measure of success is how much he reads the book after his formal education ends.

The statement of the objective would be incomplete if mention were not made of the significance of the Bible as literature. Efforts should be made to impress this significance upon the student. He should have some awareness of the reason for the prestige enjoyed by the King James version and an evaluation of that prestige in light of literary and doctrinal standards.

THE METHOD

In the matter of method a distinction must be made between teaching the Old Testament and the New. The former is obviously much more difficult to teach. The reason is clear; our religious culture is a product of the gospel as preached by Christ and the apostles and partially contained in the New Testament; I say partially, for the complete gospel is to be found in Scripture and Tradition. The belief and ethics of the New Testament are the heritage of the Catholic. The fullness of revelation came with Christ and the apostles. It is fixed. That is not to say it is static. The nature, implications, and pertinence of revealed doctrines can be studied and ever more fully perceived. In this sense there is growth to fullness. On the other hand, the ethics and beliefs of the Old Testament were in process of growth by accretion, and the books record that growth. For example the doctrine of immortality in the earlier books is not the same as the doctrines of immortality in the Wisdom literature, and in the New Testament. The ethics of the Mosaic code is not the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. In the Old Testament there is progress in religion; additional information is given. This is clearly seen in the developments of the Messianic idea; Isaias, Micheas, and Daniel added more information as derived from God. This progress is not restricted to religious ideas. It extends to ritual. It extends to customs, physicial science, in a word to everything not essential to human nature. The basic human emotions are the same in David the King or Paul the Apostle, the impulses, instincts and passions are the same, but Paul has the example of Christ and His revelation which David did not have; Paul also has the philosophy of Greece which David did not have.

The key to Old Testament teaching is to perceive and apply this progress. An illustration may serve to clarify my point. In the first chapter of Genesis is found a cosmogony or a description of the origin of the universe. It is impossible to understand the author's cosmogony without understanding his cosmology. Our cosmology is different. We consider the sun the center of the universe; he considered the earth the center. Furthermore, he considered the firmament a solid mass restraining waters above, as he conceived the earth floating in the abyss below. Scientific progress has altered our viewpoint, and to understand what he describes we must understand his viewpoint. An example next of ethical progress: the ethics of Jephte in offering his daughter in human sacrifice in fulfillment of a vow made to God. There can be no doubt that Jephte's environment influenced him. The neighboring pagans practiced human sacrifice. The ethics of a solemn vow was accepted by Jephte and his daughter. He offered her to God in what he viewed as an act of religion. Remembering that Jephte antedates not only the code of Christ, but also the code of Moses, his act does not shock one so terribly, and his tremendous faith and loyalty stand out.

What, you may ask, is the value inherent in this knowledge? I think one value asserts itself immediately, namely, the objective contrast between the Old Law and the New bring out the immeasurable pre-eminence of the gospel.

These things are written not in the pretense of being a complete case, but in the hope that the revered but unknown Book may become better known and more revered—and loved, for to love the Word of God is almost the same as loving God.

JOHN J. DOUGHERTY

Immaculate Conception Seminary,
Darlington, N. J.

MISSION INTENTION

"Aid to the Superiors of the Missions that are to be restored" is the Mission Intention for the month of August, 1947.

BROWNSON ON SALVATION AND THE CHURCH

It seems nearly all who have touched upon Brownson's exposition of the dogma *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* have overlooked certain psychological factors which in certain instances may have and in others certainly did, incline him to strict interpretation of that solemn definition of the Church. He did not altogether agree with the liberal concessions generally made by Catholics in regard to the good faith of those outside the Church. There is an interesting story related in the biography of Brownson by his son Henry. The incident occured before Brownson's conversion to the Church. Brownson had been on a lecture tour and, on his way home, while in Washington, he was one day discussing with Calhoun and Buchanan the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation, when suddenly Daniel Webster joined them. Buchanan turned to Webster, and said: "We were talking about the Catholic Church, and I, for one, am pretty well convinced that it is necessary to become a Catholic to get to heaven." "Have you just found that out?" asked Webster. "Why, I've known that for years." It should be noted, however, that Brownson's expressions of diffidence regarding the good faith of many outside the Church are of such a general nature as could be based only on general observations—whatever their validity.

It is also possible that Brownson was somewhat inclined to the strict construction of this particular dogma due to circumstances in his own case. Humanly speaking, it was with great reluctance that he went out from the midst of his Protestant brethren. His desertion from their ranks and conversion to the Church could not be looked upon by them otherwise than as a disappointment—especially by those who belonged to the movement or party of the day with which he himself had been so long associated. And although his former personal associates and friends may not have subjected him to abuse precisely on the ground that he became a Catholic, nevertheless it does seem that at times he was subjected to such abuse. One day a man by the name of Hoover, from Charleston, S. C., was abusing Brownson to his publisher, Rev. Benjamin H. Greene, as Brownson entered the book-store. Greene said: "There is Mr. Brownson now, talk to him." Hoover thereupon turned to Brownson and violently abused him for becoming a Catholic. Brownson interrupted him, saying: "Another word, and I will throw you over that stove-pipe." As the man defiantly went on, Brownson took hold of his coat-collar with one hand and the seat of his trousers with the other and pitched him over the pipe, which ran from a stove in the front part of the shop to the wall in the rear. The stricter the interpretation Brownson gave to the dogma *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, the more plain he was making it to those outside the pale of the Church that as far as he himself was concerned he had no choice in becoming a Catholic.

However much one might discount these reasons in the case, certain other reasons there are which most assuredly did influence Brownson to give to the Church's claim of exclusive salvation a strict construction. Because these reasons have been overlooked, a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding seems to have existed in many minds—those of biographers and contributors to periodical literature—concerning Brownson's interpretation of the dogma *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. But this confusion and misunderstanding need not have existed if Brownson had been read chronologically on this theological theme. No one will ever rightly understand Brownson's interpretation of this dogma who has not first read carefully his article "Recent Publications" with its illuminating introductory remarks on what was to follow so soon. That article is the real key to his whole subsequent formal treatment of this doctrinal matter. This particular article appeared in the April, 1847, issue of his *Quarterly Review*, and was the harbinger of his first *ex professo* treatise on the dogma which appeared in the very next number, the October issue of the same year, under the caption "The Great Question." Although he recurs briefly time and again throughout his writings to this dogma—it seems to have become a sore-point with him inasmuch as he had been badly badgered because of the stand he had taken—his other main discussions of this solemn definition of the Church occur in the articles: "Civil and Religious Toleration," "Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus," and his rejoinder to his critics of the last article. Briefly stated, the doctrine he uniformly set forth and defended in this matter—except perhaps for an *obiter dictum* or two which escaped him during his brief liberalistic period—was that in order to be saved one must be *in re vel in voto* a member of the *body* of the Church.

In the article "Recent Publications" Brownson deeply deplored the increasing tendency among authors of the current Catholic popular literature to soften or explain away the qualifications and restrictions which theologians attach to this dogma. (This sort of literature seems to have reached its culmination in our day in A. J. Cronin's *Keys of the Kingdom*.) Such a tendency was only aiding and abetting a fatal latitudinarianism already so rampant and widespread. Against this tendency in popular literature Brownson entered his vigorous protest. Such brief and loose explanations as generally appear in novels, periodicals, newspapers, and even some *manuals*, he said, and which from these are caught up hastily by careless, half-educated, and unreflecting readers, already under the influence of a wide latitudinarianism, are sure to be given a latitudinarian turn or twist in such wise as to become false in doctrine and harmful in effect. He asserted not only that he himself had been led so to understand those qualifications of theologians when yet a Protestant, but also that although he had never doubted, after the age of twenty, that if our Lord had established any Church at all, it was the Roman Catholic Church, he had been repelled for years—he was forty one years of age when he became a Catholic—from investigating the claims of that Church by finding Catholics apparently conceding that it was not necessary for Protestants to become united to the Church in order to be saved. Concerning the qualifications of theologians touching this dogma and the popular mind, he said:

> Theologians may restrict the language of the dogma, they may qualify its apparent sense, and their qualifications, as they themselves understand them, and as they stand in their scientific treatises for theological students, may be just and detract nothing from faith; but any qualifications or explanations made in popular works, as the general reader will understand them, especially when the tendency is to latitudinarianism, will be virtually against faith; because he does not and cannot take them in the sense of the theologians, and with the distinctions and restrictions with which they always accompany them in their own minds. We never yet heard a layman contend for what he supposed to be the theological qualification of this article of faith, without contending for what is, in fact, *contra fidem*.[1]

To Brownson's mind, then, the paramount question was: how head off and roll back this rising tide of latitudinarianism? The only answer he could find was to stress the strict construction ot the *Extra ecclesiam*. . . . To this he was already inclined on other grounds. He had learned his lesson well about liberal theology before he ever became a Catholic. In the proclamation of this solemn definition of the Church, therefore, writing in the capacity of a magazine editor, he took a practical rather than a theoretical course in the matter. Dogmatic distinctions he considered largely out of place. They could do no good, and might do much harm. With him, rightly or wrongly, it was all a matter of *polemical policy.* In other portions of his writings he speaks of telling the truth in such a manner as to have all the effects of a lie. Such, he feared, would have been the effect of any but a bold and undistinguished promulgation of the dogma *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. He was greatly fearful of giving false hopes to those outside the pale of the Church, and thought there was always less to be apprehended from saying anything that might offend them than from failing to arrest their attention and engage them earnestly in the work of investigation. If we wish to convert those outside the Church, he said, "We must preach in all its rigor the naked dogma. Give then the slightest peg, or what appears so, not to you, but to them—the slightest peg, on which to hang a hope of salvation without being in or actually reconciled to the Church by the Sacrament of Penance—and all the arguments you address to them on the necessity of being in the Church in order to be saved, will have no more effect on them than rain on a duck's back."[2] When speaking of his own conversion he asserted that had he found in Bishop J. B. Fenwick of Boston any but an intransigent attitude in regard to the Church's claim of exclusive salvation when he went to interview him about joining the Church —had Bishop Fenwick shown the least disposition to soften, to conceal or explain away what seemed to him the severity of Catholic doctrine—I should have distrusted the sincerity of his faith, have failed to give him my confidence, and have lost what I had in his Church."[3]

---

[1] *Brownson's Works* (1884), XIX, 173.

Perhaps the most popular theory resorted to by the latitudinarians to explain away the necessity of being a member of the Church in some real sense was the theory which seemed to guarantee salvation by asserting the suffiency of belonging to the so-called soul of the Church though an alien to the body. As Fr. J. C. Fenton has explained, this theory crept into Catholic thought and literature and gained a considerable currency through the misinterpretation and misapplication on the part of certain eighteenth century theologians of the terms *body and soul* of the Church as used by St. Robert Bellermine in his treatise *De ecclesia militante*, but which he himself had used merely as metaphors in elucidating various portions of his teaching on the nature or component parts of the Church.[4] But Brownson was not to be misled by such a specious theory. The body and soul of theChurch, he affirmed, like the body and soul of man are distinguishable but not separable.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, XX, 412.

[3] *Ibid.*, XIV, 475.

> The Church is not a disembodied spirit, nor a corpse. She is the Church, the living Church, only by the mutual commerce of soul and body. Their separation is the death of the Church just as much as the separation of man's soul and body is his. Communion with the body alone, on the one hand, will not suffice, and, on the other, to suppose that communion out of the body and independent of it is to fall into pure spiritualism, or simple Quakerism, which tapers out into transcendentalism or mere sentimentalism. Either extreme is the death of the Church, which is always to be regarded as at once and indissolubly soul and body.[5]

Later on he was to write the acute sentence: "There can be no more fatal mistake than to soften, liberalize, or latitudinize this terrible dogma. Out of the Church there is no salvation, or to give a man an opportunity to persuade himself that he belongs to the soul of the Church, though an alien to the body."[6]

Brownson hit out vigorously at the fiction of an invisible Church which Protestants fell back on when pressed for an explanation of where then was the Church before Luther and Calvin appeared. "The Church," he asserted, "which Catholics believe is a visible kingdom, as much so as the kingdom of France or Great Britain, and when faith assures us that out of the Church there is no salvation, the plain, obvious, natural sense is, that those living and dying out of that visible kingdom cannot be saved."[7] To yield the necessity of membership in the visible Church in order to be saved would be, he said, to leave "the dogma of faith no

[4] cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CIX, 1(Jan., 1944), 48-57.

[5] *Works*, V, 570.

[6] *Ibid.*, XX, 414.

[7] *Ibid.*, XIX, 173.

meaning which even a Socinian or a trancendentalist has any urgent occasion to reject."[8] And he cited the fact that St. Robert Bellarmine holds, as do most theologians, on the authority of St. Ambrose, that catechumens, dying before receiving the visible sacrament of baptism *in re*, may be saved; but that St. Robert Bellermine still felt a difficulty in the case, and "labored hard" to prove that "catechumens are after all, in the Church, not actually and properly, but only potentially, as a man conceived, but not yet formed and born, is called man potentially." And he further cited St. Augustine and Billuart to underscore the point that these theologians understood clearly that if they were to count as saved catechumens who die before actually receiving the sacrament of baptism, they were under the obligation to prove that they were members in some real sense, *vel re, vel voto*, of the body of the Church.[9]

Brownson's contention about the inadequacy of belonging merely to the so-called soul of the Church, or of belonging to some sort of an invisible Church or society, has been recently sustained by the Encyclical *Mystici corporis* of our reigning Pontiff, Pope Pius XII. "We deplore and condemn," he said, "the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of a society which finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously opppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction, which they introduce is baseless." Brownson's contention on this head seems to have been previously sustained likewise by the Canon Law of the Church, Canon 87, which speaks of baptism of water alone as incorporating into the Church, of bestowing personality in the kingdom of God, a personality which can be restricted in reference to rights by impediments or censures as far as the bond of ecclesiastical communion is concerned. The only medium of union with the soul of the Church, then, is through union with the body.

But some Catholics were shocked, or affected to be shocked, when they heard Brownson proclaiming to the non-Catholic public directly and unequivocally that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church. They alleged that it was harsh, illiberal, uncharitable to say so. And they proceeded to read the sturdy old reviewer lectures on the wisdom of a studied effort at presenting Catholic truth to the public in a more inoffensive mien. In this matter they held up St. Francis de Sales as a model of sweetness and light. To this, referring to his own conviction in the matter, he said:

---

[8] *Ibid.*, V, 563.

[9] *Ibid.*, XX, 398.

> We are often reminded when we insist on this, that St. Francis de Sales, whose labors restored over seventy thousand Protestants to the Church, was wont to say that "more flies can be caught with honey than vinegar." This is unquestionably true, but they who are familiar with the saint's works do not need to be told that in his own practice he gave considerable latitude to the word *honey*. Certainly we ask for no more severe and bold mode of presenting Catholic truth, or stronger or severer language against Protestants, than he was in the habit of adopting. Even the editor of his controversial works did not deem it advisable to publish them without softening some of their expressions. In fact, much of the honey of the saints generally, especially of such saints as St. Athanasius, St. Hilary of Poitiers, and St. Jerome, would taste very much like vinegar, we suspect, to some of our modern delicate palates.[10]

In the exposition of this particular dogma Brownson wrote with an absolutely assured pen, because he had gone behind the dogma to find the principle that underlies it. Every Catholic dogma, he affirmed, is but the infallible expression of some great underlying principle which it is the business of the cultivators of the profounder theological science to find out and evaluate. The principle underlying the dogma *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is the great truth or principle that "the MAN Christ Jesus is the one Mediator between God and men," and that the Church is, as it were, His visible continuation in society. St. Paul call it the "body of Christ." To be saved, then, if one is to be saved at all, one must belong in a real sense to the *body* of the Church, *in re, vel in voto*. To assert salvation through the disembodied spirit of the Church would be meaningless, since the Holy Ghost did not become incarnate, is not the one Mediator between and man, and would leave the *flesh assumed* in the womb of the Virgin Mary by the Word no office or representative in the economy of salvation. There can be no exception to this or any other dogma of the Church, for all the dogmas of the Church are *Catholic*, universal, admit of no exception; an exception in regard to this dogma or any other would negative or destroy Christianity as the theological order established by God. It was when following this line of theological reasoning that he pointed up the little word *omnino* which appears in the original definition of the Fourth Council of the Lateran: "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur."[11]

---

[10] *Ibid.*, V, 551n.

Orestes Augustus Brownson never wasted any time in his day fighting windmills or straw-men. He always attacked the enemy that held the field or was moving on to the field. The latitudinarianism or religious indifferentism he found devouring men's souls in his day, and which is devouring them with a ten-fold greater voracity in our own day, he attacked with every weapon he could bring into play from his gigantic intellectual armory. His was a most valiant fight for what he considered to be the real significance of the Church's claim of exclusive salvation, because he could not bring himself to believe that it is a small matter whether one belongs to the Church or not, whether one gains or loses Heaven forever.

THOMAS R. RYAN, C.PP.S.

New Cumberland, Pa.

---

[11] Cf. *ibid.*, XX, 392 ff.

UNION OF STATE AND HERESY

. . . The union of the State with a heresy or schism does not elevate, illuminate, and direct it. Nay, it perverts and misdirects the powers and actions of society, and turns them against the truth and law of God. The union of Protestantism with the State has produced two centuries of unexampled persecution of the Catholic faith and Church; and when the State ceased to persecute, it nevertheless kept up, by exclusion, disfranchisement, and unequal dealing, a harassing obstruction to the truth, and cruel spiritual privations against Catholics. To deliver the civil powers from the dominion and perversion of a heresy and a schism, and to restore them to a neutral impartiality, and to a natural equity towards all religious bodies, is a policy evidently wise and just.

—Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, in his *Miscellanies* (New York: The Caholic Publication Society, 1877), p. 288.

UNIFORMITY IN THE FUNERAL RITE

Undoubtedly, much of our time as priests is spent in our own church and in other churches for the purpose of joining with the Church in her solemn prayers for the dead. If we do not officiate ourselves as celebrant or as one of the sacred ministers, we at least assist at the funeral service. In doing this, we at times have noticed and it has often been remarked that there is a certain lack of uniformity in the procedure of conducting this funeral rite, especially in the Mass and Absolution.

The Church has done all in her power to bring about uniformity in her liturgical services by furnishing us with her official instructions, which come to us in the form of rubrics and decrees. These latter exist for no other purpose than to safeguard the integrity of her liturgical offices and to produce uniformity. The binding-force of rubrics and decrees is made clear in moral theology, and in our day, Canon 2 of the Code says: "All liturgical laws heretofore decreed for the celebration of Holy Mass, the recitation of the Divine Office, the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals and other sacred functions, retain their forces, except in so far as the Code explicitly corrects these laws." If the observance of these directions were only a matter of counsel and not one of precept, no one would need be disturbed if they were not observed, and, if this were true, the manner of conducting our services *could* be left to the choice of the one who conducts them. In this case, perfect uniformity would be out of the question. But when it is known that these matters demand strict obedience, then we expect the things desired, namely, uniformity of the highest order.

The words "custom" and "tradition" are found serviceable, and are used too frequently to cover up many a mistake and omission in rubrics and ceremonies. Doing things the wrong way, simply because they have been done that way over a long period of time, does not sanctify a tradition or legitimize a custom. This is more than a consistent statement. It is in line with the teachings of the Church. In fact, it can be said that customs that are contrary to the rubrics are to be rated as abuses. Some in self-defense, resort to the old adage "Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est," which according to many would mean that the old procedure is sacred, because it is traditional and therefore must be continued, even though it is at variance with ecclesiastical law and order. This is a sad commentary on the historic words of Pope Saint Stephen to Saint Cyprian.

We all feel that uniformity in the Funeral Mass and Absolution is desirable. When we are called upon to officiate in another church for a deceased relative or friend, it would be comforting to be relieved of the embarrassment that we often feel, when we are told to adhere to certain customs and traditions that are contrary to the Church's own instructions. We all want uniformity, but it cannot be brought about by coming together and deciding on a certain course to follow, if that course is not the one which the Church has prescribed. There is no way out other than to approach these official instructions with a sense of reverence, and with the understanding that they are not the product of an individual, but that they come to us from the Supreme Authority of the Church.

The following are some of these instructions which concern the Funeral Mass and Absolution:

The antipendium of the altar should be black (*Caeremoniale,* II, XI, 1).

If the Blessed Sacrament is present on the altar, the antipendium should be violet (D. 3562).

Only six candlesticks and the cross should adorn the altar. All other ornaments should be removed (*Caer.* II, XI, 1).

The candles on the altar, for the acolytes, and around the catafalque are supposed to be made of unbleached wax (*Caer.* II, XI, 1).

The candlesticks are not to be covered with violet or black cloth (D. 3059, II).

The deacon and subdeacon should not appear until Mass begins (*Rituale,* "Ordo Exsequiarum," *Tit.* VI, *Cap.* 3, 7).

Incense is not used before the Mass (*Rituale, loc. cit.*).

Birettas are prescribed for the celebrant and sacred ministers (*Missale,* "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," II, 1, 2).

If the Blessed Sacrament is not present on the altar, the celebrant bows when he approaches and leaves the altar, and when he passes the center at the time of incensing. All others genuflect at these times (*Missale,* "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," IV, 7).

A Solemn Mass with deacon and subdeacon may not be celebrated without the other ministers. We may suppose that at least two acolytes and a thurifer should be on hand (D. 3104, 2).

The Funeral Mass for priests is the one entitled "In commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum"; for others, it is the one entitled "In die obitus seu depositionis defuncti" (*Missale*).

The regulations in reference to standing, kneeling, and sitting, are of obligation. They apply to those vested in cassock and surplice—acolytes and assisting clergy (*Rubricae generales missalis*, XVII; D. 2687, 1). Torch-bearers kneel from the beginning to the end of their ministry (*Caer.*, II, XI, 7).

There are no rubrics for the laity in regard to standing, kneeling and sitting at a High Mass. Liturgists seem to agree that the laity should follow the clergy or those in the choir (or sanctuary) in this matter.

Stand in all Requiem High Masses after the prayers at the foot of the altar, whenever *Dominus vobiscum* is sung, for the singing of the Gospel, for the Preface, for the *Agnus Dei* until the Communion is completed (*usque ad sumptionem calicis inclusive*), and for the last *Dominus vobiscum* until the end of Mass (D. 3631, *Dub. 1*).

Kneel for the prayers at the foot of the altar, for the oration, during the Canon until the *Agnus Dei*, and for the Postcommunion (D. 1878).

Sit during the recitation and singing of the Epistle, Graduale, Tract, Sequence, Offertory, and after the Communion of the celebrant (*post sumptionem calicis*).

Those who are singing in the choir should *Stand* while singing (D. 2065).

All the Ordinary and Proper parts of the Requiem Mass must be sung by the choir in their entirety. Some parts may be recited *recto tono* (D. 2959, 2; 3051, 1; *Motu proprio*, III, 8, 9).

All the verses of the Sequence, *Dies irae*, are to be sung, or at least recited *recto tono* by the choir (D. 2959, 2; 3051, 1; 3956).

The ferial simple tone (not the one in use on Sundays and feast days) is the one prescribed for the Preface, *Pater noster*, versicles, oration and Postcommunion prayer (*Caer.*, I, XXVII, 2).

The organ may not be used except as an accompaniment for the singing of the choir (*Caer.*, I, XXVIII, 13).

The acolyte candles should always be lighted. They are not held at the Gospel (*Caer.*, II, XI, 6; *Missale*, "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," XIII, 2; *Rituale*, "Ordo Exsequiarum," *Tit*. VI, *Cap*. 3, 7).

The deacon and subdeacon do not stand *unus post alium* during the Introit and "Kyrie," but they take the same positions as in other solemn Masses (*Missale*, "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," IV).

Incense is used and blessed (*Per intercessionem Beati Michaelis* etc.) by the celebrant at the Offertory only. (*Missale*, "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," XIII, 2). The deacon assists the celebrant, saying: *Benedicite* (*Pater*) *Reverende*, or *Reverendissime* if a bishop celebrates.

The subdeacon does the incensing at the Elevation—not in the center, but on the lowest step of the Epistle side of the altar. He should not put incense in the censer. This should be done by a acolyte (*Caer.*, II, 8; D. 2515, *ad* 10).

After the celebrant sings *Dominus vobiscum* before the last Gospel, the latter recites and the deacon sings, *Requiescant in pace*. Both should face the altar at this time, and this prayer is always in the plural in the Mass (D. 1613; *Missale*, "Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae," XI, 1).

The celebrant does not recite any prayers *clara voce* in a Requiem High Mass (*Rubricae generales missalis*, XVI, 3).

At funerals, the prescribed ordo of prayers should be observed (D. 3515, *Dub*. VI).

After the Mass, the celebrant and sacred ministers do not go to the sacristy, but they go *per breviorem* to the Epistle side (to the celebrant's bench) and prepare for the Absolution. All three take off their maniples. The celebrant removes the chasuble and put on a black cope (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

No priest is allowed to give the Absolution unless he was the celebrant of the Mass. A bishop, as Ordinary in his own diocese, may give the Absolution even though he was not the celebrant of the Mass (D. 3029, 10; 3798, 2).

If there is a sermon, it is preached immediately after the Mass. The preacher wears neither surplice nor stole. A cloak (ferraiolo) is worn over the cassock, as it is the complement to the cassock. The preacher simply bows to the bishop (D. 2888; *Caer.*, II, II, 10).

The Absolution follows the Mass if there is no sermon; otherwise, it comes after the sermon (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

The Absolution is the one entitled "Presente corpore" in the Roman Ritual.

The subdeacon takes the cross between two acolytes with lighted candles and always stands at the head of the body. He faces the altar unless the deceased is a priest. He stands at a sufficient distance to allow the celebrant to bow to the cross (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

The subdeacon stands (facing the body) between the body and the altar if the deceased is a priest (D. 2392, 2).

The celebrant says (or sings *recto tono*) the *Non intres* (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

The deacon stands at the celebrant's left (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

The celebrant is expressly directed to say the *Non intres* and to sing all the prayers of the Absolution with hands joined and the book is to be held for him (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7, 10).

The choir sings the *Libera me Domine*, but not until the celebrant has completed the recitation of the *Non intres* (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 8).

When the choir repeats the singing of the words *Libera me Domine* of the responsory, the celebrant puts incense in the censer and blesses it with the words *Ab illo benedicaris, in cujus honore cremaberis. Amen.* The deacon assists in the usual way saying to the celebrant: *Benedicite Pater Reverende. Reverendissime*, if a bishop gives the absolution.

The deacon ministers to the right of the celebrant after the latter blesses the incense (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 10).

The celebrant sings the words *Pater noster;* then the deacon hands him the sprinkler and accompanies him holding the cope. The rest of the *Pater noster* is not said aloud but secretly by all (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 10).

The deacon hands to the celebrant first the sprinkler and then the censer. The celebrant returns the same to the deacon (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 10).

The celebrant bows to the cross and the deacon genuflects (*Rituale*, VI. 3, 10).

The prayer, *Deus cui proprium*, concludes the Absolution *Presente corpore* in the church when a priest officiates. Nothing more is to be added to this (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 10).

When a bishop gives the Absolution, after the completion of the prayer *Deus cui proprium*, he adds, *Requiem aeternam dona ei*

Domine, making the sign of the cross over the body. The changers conclude by singing, *Requiescat in pace*, (*Caer.*, II. XI, 12).

It is improper and contrary to the rubrics for the one who gives the Absolution *Presente corpore*, to conclude the Absolution (assigned for the church) with the prayer *Anima ejus et animae omnium fidelium defunctorum per misericordiam Dei, requiescant in pace.* (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 10).

The proper processional for the funeral of adults is the responsory *Subvenite sancti Dei.* This should be sung by the choir when the body is carried into the church (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 4).

The proper recessional for the funeral of adults is the antiphon *In paradisum.* This should be sung by the choir after the Absolution is completed and while the body is carried out of the church (*Rituale*, VI, 3, 7).

The Absolution may never follow a Feast Day Mass (D. 2186; 3014, 1).

G. V. PREDMORE

Rochester, N. Y.

THEOLOGY AS A PRINCIPAL OF UNITY

When we speak of theology as a unifying principle . . . we mean first of all not natural theology but dogmatic or revealed theology. The unification that comes from philosophy alone—the unification of metaphysics even when it is made to include natural theology—is not enough. Since God has spoken, man cannot afford to ignore His voice if he is not to jeopardize his salvation. Secondly, we must bear in mind that theology, like metaphysics, is both a science and a wisdom. A science examines and proves in the light of its own principles. Wisdom adds to this the vantage point of the highest attainable principles or causes, a vantage point that enables its possessor to survey the whole field of knowledge and reality and thus be able to pass judgment on other subordinate sciences. This function of ordering and judging from a higher vantage point belongs in the natural order of knowledge to metaphysics. . . . Theology is likewise a wisdom as well as a science, since in the light of revelation it orders and judges all reality from the standpoint of God, first in the order of being and highest cause of all.

—The Rev. Dr. William R. O'Connor, in "The Wisdom of Theology," printed in the first volume of the *Proceedings* of The Catholic Theological Society of America (Washington, D. C.: Holy Redeemer College, 1947), pp. 27 f.

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

There is a definite body of instruction within the science of sacred theology about the duties and the special prerogatives of the secular priest. This theological doctrine is called the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood. It consists in the explanation of that portion of God's revealed message that deals with the position and the function of the diocesan priesthood in the Catholic Church. The diocesan priest and the seminarian preparing himself to accept a call to the diocesan priesthood need this instruction in order to appreciate the dignity God has given them and the responsibilities He has laid upon them. Furthermore, any man who wishes to study the science of sacred theology adequately and accurately must take cognizance of the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood, since this teaching forms an integral and necessary part of the treatise *de Ecclesia Christi.*

The basic factor in the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood is, of course, the doctrine about the place of the secular priest in the divine constitution of the Catholic Church. The science of sacred theology gives us the revealed teaching that in each fully established local Church or diocese within the true Church of Jesus Christ the bishop rules the faithful in his capacity as a member of the apostolic *collegium.* In each one of these local Churches, however, by reason of the way in which Our Lord has instituted and formed the society of His disciples, the bishop has a brotherhood or *collegium* of priests to assist him in the sacerdotal administration of his diocese. This brotherhood of priests, subject to the bishop and organized *unice et ex integro* for the task of assisting him in the care of his faithful, is called the diocesan *presbyterium.* The bishop himself is the sole head and, theologically, the *perfector* of this sacerdotal fraternity. The *presbyterium* has no ruler apart from the bishop. It has no function apart from its essential purpose of working under the bishop's direction for the sanctification and the salvation of those entrusted to his apostolic care.

As a member of this brotherhood, the diocesan priest does the work of Christ in His Church only when he gives a charitable and ungrudgingly loyal obedience to his bishop, and when he manifests a genuine and fraternal loyalty to his fellow priests of the *presbyterium.* Furthermore, his fidelity in Our Lord's service depends upon his taking practical cognizance of the fact that the work or the objective of his sacerdotal fraternity demands a high degree of spiritual perfection and true theological learning on his own part. To do properly the work to which God has called him, the individual diocesan priest must remember that he is essentially a member of a special sacerdotal community within the true Church of Jesus Christ. He must, moreover, order his entire life towards achieving the objective to which the *presbyterium* itself has been consecrated and assigned by the divine Founder of the Church.

THE ULTIMATE PURPOSE OF THE "PRESBYTERIUM"

Since God has constituted His Church in such a way that the *collegium* of diocesan priests in a local Church is organized solely and essentially to aid the bishop in his care for souls, the inherent and basic purpose of the *presbyterium* can be nothing else than the end of the episcopal office itself. As a member of the apostolic *collegium*, each residential bishop belongs to the group which, under the leadership of Peter, has been established by Our Lord to govern His Church on earth by His authority and to direct the faithful to their eternal goal. Consequently the purpose of the apostolic *collegium* in the Church as a whole, and the purpose of each member of that body in the local Church over which he presides, is identical with that of the Church itself, and with the purpose for which Christ came into the world. Our Lord described that purpose when He told His disciples that "I have come that they may have life and may have it more abundantly."[1] Catholic theology explains this divine teaching when it informs us that the Church exists in order that God may be glorified in the salvation and sanctification of men through the Christian religion.[2] That is the basic and essential purpose of the Church universal. It is also the basic and essential purpose of every local Church or diocese within the Catholic Church. In order to accomplish God's will through the salvation and sanctification of men, the bishop and his *presbyterium* work in the individual Catholic diocese. All of those whom God calls to work within His Church labor for the achievement of this end. Nevertheless, it remains in a special way the direct and immediate responsibility of the apostolic *collegium* and of the brotherhood of diocesan priests attached to each residential bishop within the society of the disciples.[3]

---

[1] *John* 10: 10.

[2] Cf. De Guibert, *De Christi ecclesia* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1928), pp. 125 ff; Zapelena, *De ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1946), I, 108 ff; Vellico, *De ecclesia Christi* (Rome: A. Arnodo, 1940), pp. 445 f; Parente, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Turin: Marietti, 1946), p. 150.

In order to understand the nature and the working of the *presbyterium*, however, it is vitally important to realize that Our Lord has so fashioned His Church that the labors of the bishop and his sacerdotal *collegium* for the sanctification and salvation of men should be directed towards a definite and concrete objective. The bishop and his diocesan priests have before them in God's revealed message a kind of blue-print or architect's drawing, telling them precisely and specifically the immediate good Our Lord wills that they should try to achieve among their people. This blue-print is the description of the local Church as a social unit rich and perfect in the life of faith and of charity. The formation and the completion of such a Church is the immediate objective of the diocesan priesthood. The construction or edification (from the Greek **οἰκοδομή**, rendered in the Vulgate by *aedificatio*) of the Church in line with the pattern presented in divine revelation is thus the essential business of the *presbyterium* and of its individual members.

UT ECCLESIA AEDIFICATIONEM ACCIPIAT

Quite frequently in the course of his epistles St. Paul employed the term **οἰκοδομή** and the cognate verb **οἰκοδομέω** to designate the perfective work God commands in and for the Church of Jesus Christ. The Apostle of the Gentiles used this figure in explaining how his own apostolic and sacerdotal work within the Church and the priestly labors of other men would finally be evaluated by God.

> . . . And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor.
>
> For we are God's coadjutors. You are God's husbandry: you are God's building (ὀικοδομή).

---

[3] The apostolic mission of the diocesan clergy is the central theme of Dr. Thils' brilliant book, *Nature et spiritualité du clergé diocésain* (Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1946).

> According to the grace of God that is given to me, as a wise architect I have laid the foundation: and another buildeth (ἐποικοδομεῖ) thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.
>
> For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid: which is Christ Jesus.
>
> Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble.
>
> Every man's work shall be manifest. For the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire. And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.
>
> If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.
>
> If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.[4]

In the above passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul spoke of the various contributions of different priestly workers to the welfare of the Church in terms of the worth of the materials they contribute and incorporate into the structure of Our Lord's society. This text deals only with good priestly workers, with those who will themselves be saved. A subsequent passage in the same chapter of this Epistle tells of the terrible retribution that awaits those who harm the Church of God by teachings and practices calculated to turn men away from Christ. Speaking of these evil teachers in the Church, St. Paul says: "But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which you are."[5]

St. Paul, then, distinguishes three different kinds of work done within the Church of God. In the first place, there are the efforts of those who teach in such a way as to distort or deny the true doctrine of Jesus Christ within the society of His disciples. Such action constitutes a perversion of the very purpose of the Church itself. St. Paul characterized this abuse of the sacred ministry as a violation of God's temple. This violation of the temple is the very antithesis of the "edification" or building up of the Church, done by worthy and loyal sharers in the apostolate.

The second type of work is described in the First Epistle to the Corinthians in terms of building imperfect and corruptible material into the temple of God. The men who are responsible for this harm to the Church have obviously no intention of being disloyal to Christ. They are classed among those who edify or build up, rather than among those who violate, the temple of the living God. Nevertheless, they remain responsible for the unworthiness of their own efforts. They are not to be ranked by God among those who have contributed a genuine good to the company of His Son. Their teaching, while not an outright contradiction of God's revealed doctrine, remains as something useless, something which God himself will destroy out of His temple. Although the workers themselves shall be saved, their works in the Church will be destroyed by God as not conforming to the pattern that He has set up to guide and govern the labors of the apostolic ministry.

---

[4] *I Cor.* 3: 8-15.

[5] *I Cor.* 3: 17.

Finally there are those who have built or truly "edified" according to the divine plan of the Church. The accomplishments of these faithful workers for Christ in the society of His disciples is compared to precious material, gold, silver, and jewels, built into the house or temple of God. These men will be saved, and they will receive a special reward for the faithful service they have given to the Master. The man who works for Christ in the diocesan priesthood must hope and strive to place himself within this class.

St. Paul hoped that his own efforts in teaching the Corinthians would rebound to the "edification" or building up of their Church. "We speak before God in Christ," he told them, "but all things, my dearly beloved, for your edification (ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς)."[6] The power of the apostolate itself is represented as something given to St. Paul, and to the others who have recieved it, precisely for the sake of this "edification." It is to be used solely for this end. "For if also I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed."[7]

CHRIST THE EXEMPLAR

In his Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul gives us a clear picture of the objective towards which the apostolic or diocesan construction or edification of the Church must proceed. This objective, of course, provides the blue-print to govern and to explain the activity of the *presbyterium*. St. Paul speaks of the organized disciples of Christ in terms of a "building (οἰκοδομή)," which, "being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple of the Lord."[8] According to this inspired teaching, then, there is definitely meant to be a growth, an increase in perfection, within the true Church of Jesus Christ.

---

[6] *II Cor.* 12: 19.

[7] *II Cor.* 10: 8.

Futhermore, this growth or development of the Church is the immediate responsibility of the men to whom God has granted the apostolic powers and of the men whom He has called to aid the members of the apostolic *collegium*. They hold their authority from God precisely in order that they may work for this edification or growth of the Church.

> And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors:
>
> For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.[9]

The ultimate term of this growth or construction of the Church is Our Lord Himself. In other words, the ministry of the bishop and of his diocesan priests must be expended in such a way that the local Church entrusted to the bishop's care lives a corporate life fully conformed to the life and the grace of Jesus Christ. Our Lord, moreover, is far from being merely the exemplar or the model for His Church's holiness. The Church grows "unto" Christ, not only in so far as it come to resemble Him more completely as it advances in holiness, but also in so far as an increase in charity within the Church membership binds the disciples ever more intimately to Him in the unity of His Mystical Body.

St. Paul thus describes the term and the direction of the construction or edification of the Church to which the lives and the efforts of Christ's apostolic workers are consecrated. This passage is the continuation of the one we have just seen. The "edifying" of Christ's Church is meant to proceed

> Until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ:
>
> That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive.
>
> But doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ:
>
> From whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined to-

---

[8] *Eph.* 2: 21.

[9] *Eph.* 4: 11-12.

gether, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity.[10]

Actually then, according to St. Paul, the growth or the construction of the Church is meant to result in a perfection of faith and of charity. Christ's apostolic laborers must strive to bring about a perfect unity of faith among His disciples. The unity of faith involves the completely certain acceptance of the Christian teaching, accurately and authoritatively expounded within the Church by Our Lord through the men He has commissioned. The men who live in this unity of faith are assailed by false teachers, who seek to deceive them and to take their knowledge of Christ away from them. The apostolic ministry edifies the Church and contributes towards its growth in the line of faith to the extent that, by clear, adequate, and accurate preaching of the divine message, they counteract, with ever increasing effectiveness, the efforts of those who seek to pervert the faith of Christ among His people. The Church grows in the perfection of faith when the members of the Church are so correctly instructed and well grounded in their faith that they are no longer in immediate danger from the teachers who purvey error under the guise of Christian doctrine. Such a growth is "unto a perfect man," since it is the normal process of development within the Mystical Body of Christ, the visible Catholic Church. It is "unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ" because it is an increase in supernatural perfection according to the standard of Christ Himself. Through the faithful ministration of the bishop and his *presbyterium*, the individual Catholic is meant to attain a status of supernatural maturity, in which he is competent to withstand efforts against the purity of his faith in Christ.

The edification of the Church in doctrine is the development of a common faith, the corporate belief of the society of Our Lord's disciples. In the same way, the construction or building up of the Church in charity is the fostering of a genuine corporate love within the *ecclesia*. The bishop and his *presbyterium* are commissioned by God to work for the continual increase of divine love of brotherhood in the Church as a whole. It is not enough that individual members should love God. According to St.

---

[10] *Eph.* 4: 13-16.

Paul's teaching, every member, every part, of the Church must contribute to the common and corporate love, in which the visible society of the Roman communion, the true and only Church of Jesus Christ on earth, advances in holiness according to the pattern God has designed.

THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT AS AN OBJECTIVE

In edifying or building up the Church of God in this world and in contributing towards the growth of Christ's Mystical Body, the bishop and his diocesan priests act as the instruments of Our Lord Himself. The constructing of the Church, the development and the perfecting of God's temple, must be recognized as His work and His prerogative. He died for the Church. He sanctifies and purifies it, in order that ultimately it may be with Him forever in heaven, cleansed of every imperfection and impurity. Such is the teaching of St. Paul.

> . . . Christ also loved the Church and delivered himself up for it:
>
> That he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life:
>
> That he might present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing: but that it should be holy and without blemish.[11]

The Church will be perfectly conformed to Christ, and each member of the Church will be inseparably united with Him, only when the company of the disciples is no longer in its place of pilgrimage. When the status of the Church militant is no more, when the onslaughts of the prince of this world, the enemy of Christ, have been forever destroyed, the Church of God will contain no impurity. Each member of the Church will then be immutably joined to Christ in the Church's bonds of union.

Our Lord's work for the Church tends ultimately and irrevocably towards this objective. He has formed, and He maintains and dwells in, a society which is not meant to live always in this world, but which will be at home perfectly and forever in heaven. The apostolic workers Christ has commissioned and placed within the society of His disciples work for the same ultimate goal. In the cities and towns of this world the bishops and the diocesan priests are charged with the responsibility of preparing citizens for the courts of heaven. They are working in and for one of the many societies visible on earth, and they strive to prepare that society and its members for the eternal and supernatural glories of heaven, where alone that society is perfectly and essentially at home.

---

[11] *Eph.* 5: 25-27.

Thus the Church triumphant in heaven is the thing the *presbyterium* seeks to form. All of the labors of the diocesan priesthood are, in the last analysis, directed towards the achievement of this ultimate and eternal perfection by the Church of Jesus Christ. Actually, then, the diocesan priesthood is charged with the responsibility of trying, by the use of every resource at its disposal, to give the individual local Church an increase of the supernatural good which will find its ultimate status in the Church triumphant, and to take out of the local Church all of those evils and imperfections incompatible with the life of heaven. The Church in heaven, the "glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle,"[12] is, then, the objective of the *presbyterium*.

THE PATTERN IN THE CHURCH MILITANT

At the same time, however, we have several pictures, in the epistles of St. Paul, of the Church militant in some community in this world actually developing, as God wills and commands that it should develop, towards the ultimate and definite perfection of the Church triumphant. Several times in the course of his writings, the Apostle of the Gentiles gives thanks to God for the spiritual condition of the Christian communities he instructs. The qualities which St. Paul thanks God for placing in the Church are manifestly those which, according to the divine revelation, must exist in the local Church which lives according to the divine pattern.

Thus the Apostle of the Gentiles thanks God for the wealth of grace He has given to the local Church in Corinth.

> I give thanks to my God always for you, for the grace of God that is given you in Christ Jesus:
>
> That in all things you are made rich in Him, in all utterance and in all knowledge;
>
> As the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you.
>
> So that nothing is wanting to you in any grace, waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ.[13]

---

[12] *Eph.* 5: 27.

St. Paul was grateful to God for making the Church of the Corinthians the kind of society Our Lord wills His disciples to constitute in any city. The Church of God in pilgrimage at Corinth is represented as enjoying the complete accuracy of Christian teaching and the vigorous life of divine grace which a local Church is meant to have. The *presbyterium* of any diocese is consecrated to the task of making its own local Church rich in the vigor and accuracy of its faith in Christ and strong in its life of charity. Thus the picture of this primitive local Church constitutes the blue-print to guide the activity of the diocesan priest. God Himself wills that every local Church should be such a perfect company of Christ's disciples. The local Church or diocese, rich in faith and charity, is the real and *immediate* objective of the diocesan priesthood.

St. Paul brings out this same objective even more powerfully in his Epistle to the Ephesians. He thanks God for the grace He has given to the Church of Ephesus, in making that Church firm and correct in its faith, and strong in the fraternal charity of the *ecclesia*. Then he proceeds to point out the advance in faith and charity which this favored Church can and should make, in order to continue faithful in the service of God.

> Wherefore, I also, hearing of your faith that is in the Lord Jesus and of your love towards all the saints,
>
> Cease not to give thanks for you, making commemoration of you in my prayers,
>
> That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, in the knowledge of him:
>
> The eyes of your heart enlightened that you may know what the hope is of his calling and what are the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.[14]

St. Paul prayed that his Philippians might remain and might increase in holiness as a perfect local Church. The good for which he petitioned God was the objective for which he labored among his converts. It is likewise the necessary objective of the apostolic labors and the prayers of the bishop and his diocesan priests.

> And this I pray: That your charity may more and more abound in knowledge and in all understanding:

---

[13] *I Cor.* 1: 4-7.

[14] *Eph.* 1: 15-18.

> That you may approve the better things: that you may be sincere and without offence unto the day of Christ:
>
> Filled with the fruits of justice, through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.[15]

The Church of the Philippians was among the most fervent of all the Christian communities in the apostolic time. Yet, even in this community, St. Paul wills a definite advance in corporate as well as individual spiritual perfection. He wills that the charity of the Church as a whole (and not merely the individual charity of certain persons within the company) should abound more and more. Furthermore, in this same epistle, St. Paul has given an even more detailed description of the objective of the diocesan priesthood, a picture of the Church at Philippi as he wishes to hear about it and to see it on his next visit.

> Only let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ: that, whether I come and see you, or, being absent, may hear of you, that you stand fast in one spirit, with one mind laboring together for the faith of the gospel.
>
> And in nothing be ye terrified by the adversaries: which to them is a cause of perdition, but to you of salvation. And this from God.
>
> For unto you it is given for Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for him:
>
> Having the same conflict as that which you have seen in me and now have heard of me.
>
> If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any society of the spirit, if any bowels of commiseration:
>
> Fulfil ye my joy, that you be of one mind, having the same charity, being of one accord, agreeing in sentiment.[16]

The diocesan priesthood, then, is commissioned to work for the edification or upbuilding of a local Church like those for which St. Paul rendered thanks to God and those which he wished to see in the various communities of converts he had made. The perfect local Church, as it is described in this divine diagram or pattern, bears certain manifest marks or characteristics. The *presbyterium* must, in order to be faithful to God, concentrate its efforts upon an attempt to bring these marks into the local Church within which it labors on the apostolic mission.

A local Church made up of Catholics firm and accurately instructed in the faith, a company of disciples enthusiastically trying to bring converts into the Church, particularly from the ranks of their own neighbors; a diocese of Catholics tenderly and manifestly attached to one another in the bonds of Christ; a Church of God composed of Catholics rich in charity and effectively guiding their own lives by its norms: this is the reality which the *presbyterium* and the individual diocesan priest seek to foster in the sacerdotal ministry. This is the concrete and immediate objective of the secular priesthood. This reality, and nothing less, is what God demands that the diocesan priest work for in His service.

---

[15] *Phil.* 1: 9-11.

[16] *Phil.* 1: 27-30 and 2: 1-2.

In fidelity to God, neither the bishop nor his *presbyterium* can be satisfied when the Christian flock over which the bishop rules in the name of Christ is in any way or to any degree less perfect than God demands that it should be. If tepidity of spirit or failure to appreciate the ineffable value of membership in the Church should dampen the missionary spirit among the people of God, it is the duty and the high privilege of the diocesan priest, as the instrument of his bishop, to work for the eradication of these imperfections with all the resources of his divine ministry. Should dissension, or misinformation, or mere spiritual torpor disrupt or diminish the *amor fraternitatis* which by God's own command is the first social duty of Christ's disciples, the secular priest must strive to destroy these evils by the arms of truth and charity. When any of the faithful of the local Church show themselves by their conduct unworthy of their discipleship in Jesus Christ, it is the business of the diocesan priest to labor for the reform of the sinners, no matter how fashionable the way of their walking apart from Our Lord may happen to be at the moment. If confusion or weakness of faith should trouble the flock, the people must find enlightenment and strength in their *presbyterium*.

The objective of the diocesan priesthood is such that the members of the *presbyterium* can never consider themselves satisfied completely with the spiritual condition of their flocks. Laboring under the paternal rule of its episcopal leader, the *presbyterium* strives to present to God, not only a number of saints in the local Church, but a local Church that lives, corporately as well as in its individuals, the life of spiritual perfection. Like St. Paul, the bishop and his diocesan priests desire to have their flock "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind laboring together (*συναθλοῦντες*) for the faith of the gospel."[17]

It is a commonplace of spiritual theology that there is no limit at which the perfection of charity can cease to advance in the individual Christian. In other words there is no stage of perfection so high that the man who arrives at it can afford to tell himself that he loves God intensely and perfectly enough. The human soul's efforts to love and please God can never be completely adequate to and worthy of God's infinite goodness and majesty. Hence at any given point in the individual person's progress towards God along the way of spiritual perfection, this person is called by God to love Him even more intensely and effectively.[18]

Exactly the same condition prevails in the realm of corporate perfection. The individual local Church can never reach a status of such excellence that the bishop and his *presbyterium* can be completely satisfied with it. There will never be a situation in which the men whom God calls upon to minister to the local Church can consider themselves justified in ceasing from strenuous and sincere efforts to make this individual Church of God better enlightened and strengthened in its faith and more ardent in its love of God. The bishop and his *presbyterium* realize that it is their function to strive with all the forces at their command to give Our Lord, in their own local Church, "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."[19] No matter how perfect and well-ordered the local Church may be, it can never be considered adequately worthy of the Lord dwelling within it. Always the men whom God has called to do the work of the apostolic mission within that Church must labor to make it more perfect, so that its charity "may more and more abound in knowledge and in all understanding."[20]

THE PRAYER OF THE *PRESBYTERIUM*

Furthermore, by its very essence, the objective of the diocesan priesthood is something absolutely beyond the natural competence of any man. A holy and perfect Church of God dwelling as a pilgrim in some city or district of this world is something which only the divine power of Jesus Christ can produce and prosper.

---

[17] *Phil.* 1: 27.

[18] Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 24, a. 7.

[19] *Eph.* 5: 27.

[20] *Phil.* 1: 9.

The man whom Our Lord calls and commissions to labor for the building and the perfection of this Church must realize that his efforts can be effective only in so far as the strength of God's grace is with him. When administering the sacraments, which produce their salvific effect *ex opere operato*, the priest is infallibly certain that his own efforts are instrumental in bringing the life of grace to his people. For the rest of his sacerdotal ministry, however, the priest has no such guarantee. In order to assure himself of the divine power by which alone his work among the people will prove fruitful, the priest must have recourse to prayer.

Hence, for the diocesan priesthood, the life of prayer is more than an affair of individual devotion. Since only that true and Christian prayer which Our Lord Himself assures us will always be heard can serve to make apostolic work effective towards the realization of that objective to which the *presbyterium* itself is consecrated, prayer is an absolutely essential element for the sincere and successful prosecution of the work of the secular priesthood. The diocesan priest knows quite well that all of his life and all of his efforts have been consecrated to God for the achievement of that objective for which God wills that the bishop and his *presbyterium* should labor in the Church of Jesus Christ. This objective, the local Church living a corporate life of Christian perfection, cannot be realized apart from the fullness of prayer. The man who would live in the diocesan priesthood without pouring out his desires to God in the sacerdotal prayer of petition would show himself careless and radically insincere in his allegiance to the priesthood of Christ Himself.

Prayer, after all, is the petition of fitting things from God. It is the pouring out of our inmost and basic desires in the Christian life to God, by whom alone these desires can be fulfilled. The basic personal desire of a well ordered Christian life is and must be the glory of God through the accomplishment of the particular function in life to which the man praying is dedicated. The immediate purpose of the episcopate and of the *presbyterium* in the Church of God in this world is the formation and the increment of a perfect local Church. In the sense that the *presbyterium* is really charged to aid the bishop in the accomplishment of this purpose, prayer for the attainment of this particular objective, the local Church perfected and united in an ardent divine charity, is the characteristic prayer of the diocesan priesthood.

The immediate objective of the prayer which is characteristically that of the diocesan priesthood is no merely abstract or unreal consideration. Charity and zeal for souls demand that the secular priest petition God in all the ardor and strength of his soul for the granting of graces immediately necessary. A man does not beg God in Christian prayer merely for the realization of some vague plans, to be taken seriously only under a set of circumstances other than that now existent. The objective of the diocesan priesthood is the local Church, more perfect here and now, by reason of the prayer and the efforts of the priest himself. The characteristic prayer of the *presbyterium*, then, primarily envisions a spiritual good for the Church of God, to be given to the Church through the instrumentality of the diocesan priest, in the circumstances that obtain at the present moment.

The tendency to overlook the primarily practical and concrete nature of our own objective is one of the most dangerous temptations into which the diocesan priest may fall. It is always comparatively easy to think of a great many blessings which we could and would render to the Church of God under other circumstances or in another position. Yet to think of serving God by working for the edification of His Church primarily in terms of a situation which does not exist is actually to refuse Him the work He demands in the existing set of circumstances. God wills that the individual diocesan priest should put all of his energy into the task of attempting to realize, in his own surroundings, with the associates and the people among whom he actually lives, the objective of the *presbyterium*. In the actual position in which he finds himself placed by his bishop, each diocesan priest must labor to form a Christian people strong in the faith, ardently enthusiastic for missionary endeavor, united among themselves in bonds of charity, and perfect in the love of Christ.

This, then, is the high objective of the diocesan priesthood. The bishop's *presbyterium* is commissioned by God Himself to labor for the upbuilding of its own local Church into a perfect company of Our Lord's disciples. This sacerdotal brotherhood is immediately responsible to God for the care of the people subject in Christ to its bishop. By its unremitting labors in the local Church, the *presbyterium* must strive to make its own *plebs Dei* into a counterpart of the Christian communities described by St. Paul.

In laboring for the accomplishment of this specific and concrete objective, the diocesan priesthood prepares the Church on earth for its eternal and absolute perfection as the Church triumphant in heaven. It works upon the souls of the people confided to its care so as to make these souls ever more perfectly conformed to and united with Our Lord Jesus Christ. Only by working for the attainment of the perfect Church of God in this world does the *presbyterium* accomplish the mission God had given to it in the company of Our Lord's disciples.

It goes without saying that the *presbyterium* and the individual diocesan priest must utilize every possible resource and asset for the attainment of the perfect local Church. The divine sacraments give their grace *ix opere operato* for the achievement of this objective. Furthermore, all that the diocesan priest can do in the way of accurate and adequate instruction, all of the patience, zeal, and charity he can command, must be poured out for this same purpose. St. Paul gave St. Timothy, his disciple and auxiliary an indication of what working for the apostolic objective would entail.

> I charge thee, before God and Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead, by his coming and his kingdom:
>
> Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season: reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine.[21]

All that the diocesan priest is able to do by his sacramental ministry, by his instructions, by his urgings and entreaties; all of this must be expanded in order that the Church of God may live in fidelity and loyalty to Christ in this world. All that the prayer and the sacrifice of the diocesan priesthood can win from God must, in the apostolic charity of the *presbyterium*, be devoted to the edification of Our Lord's kingdom. Whatever there may be in the temperament or the life of the secular priest that would militate against the realization of his essential and immediate objective, must be plucked out and destroyed. Thus, in the loyal and complete devotion to their objective, diocesan priests find the ultimate expression of their own spirituality.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[21] *II Tim.* 4: 1-2.

Answers to Questions

MISSA IN ALIENA ECCLESIA

Question 1: In the case of a regular whose order has its own calendar, with proper Masses for certain feasts, when he is stationed for a time away from his monastery in a place where the common calendar of the Church is used, I know that he is bound to follow the local calendar. But when a feast occurs, which in the regular Roman calendar is a *duplex*, but in his own calendar a double of the first or second class, having a proper Mass, may he celebrate the feast as one of high rank, using the proper text with *credo* and proper Sequence and Preface, where these have been granted, or must he celebrate the feast just as it appears in the local Ordo?

Question 2: When a regular is stationed for a time in a place using the Roman Calendar and a feast occurs which is proper to his own individual monastery but not to the entire order or to the entire province of it, must he celebrate the office of the place, or the one common to his order outside his monastery, or may he say the office proper to his own monastery? A case in point of the titular of his monastery or the anniversary of the dedication of its church.

Answer: It seems to us that the solution of the above difficulties will be found in the application of these general principles:

(1) As to the celebration of Mass, a visiting priest as well as one belonging to the church in question, must follow the local calendar. As that brings with it the privilege of saying Masses in honor of mysteries and Saints, and also *Beati*, which do not appear in the universal calendar, using proper Masses, with their Sequences and Prefaces, where such have been conceded, so also it implies the observance of the local Ordo even when this means abandoning one's own proper calendar, which he would follow when celebrating in a church of his own congregation (f. S. R. C. 3924 *ad* 3).

(2) In general, for the recitation of the Office, one follows his own Breviary, with all its peculiar feasts, wherever he says the Divine Office. This presumes that the cleric in question is merely visiting and in no way *addictus* to the church outside his monastery.

BLESS-ED OR BLEST

Question: A point has come up in our community regarding the pronunciation of the word "Blessed" in the Divine Praises, which are recited at Benediction. Some Fathers hold for the pronunciation of the word as a monosyllable, "blest", while others say it should be a dissyllable, "blessed." We have looked up the matter but are unable to arrive at a conclusion.

Answer: Certant grammatici et adhuc sub judice lis set. The question of the pronunciation of the word "blessed" as a monosyllable or a dissyllable must remain unsolved in any definitive fashion. The *Standard Dictionary* gives both pronunciations but lists the dissyllable first. In the definition, it states its preference for *blest*, when the participial sense is more prominent. Then, in the illustrative quotation, we find that in the reading of the Scriptures, *blessed*, the dissyllable, should be used, the form *blest* being reserved for current speech. Our own preference, in the use of the word in prayers like the Divine Praises, or in the Sacred Scriptures, is for the bisyllabic, form, *bless-ed*, and this seems to represent the more prevalent ecclesiastical usage. However, in the language of the London coster: "You pays your money and takes your choice."

A QUESTION OF THE TONE OF VOICE AT LOW MASS

Question: The rubics of the Missal definitely state that the Epistle, Gradual, Tract, Sequence, and Gospel in a Low Mass are to be read by the celebrant in a clear voice. Is it allowed for the celebrant to read these parts of the Mass *submissa voce*, while another priest reads the Epistle and Gospel in English? Is this departure from the rubics justifiable?

Answer: The distinction of the three tones of voice, *clara*, *mediocris*, *secreta*, belongs to the rubrical prescriptions governing the celebration of Mass (cf. *Rubricae generales missalis*, XVI), which no priest may change. The rubrics, indeed, provide (*Loc. cit.*) that where several priests are celebrating simultaneously in the same church, the *vox clara* should not be so loud as to disturb the celebrants at other altars. The case proposed by our enquirer is one which the Church does not contemplate. Nothing else is presumed to be in progress while Mass is being celebrated and no provision is made, by liturgical authority, for synchronizing the reading of the Scripture in English while the same passages are being read at the altar as the Epistle and Gospel of the Mass.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

PRESENCE OF MATTER FOR CONSECRATION

Question: Why is it that the hosts in a ciborium which the priest forgot to open before the consecration are considered to be certainly consecrated, whereas a host inadvertently left under the base of the chalice is probably not consecrated?

Answer: One of the requisite conditions for the valid consecration of the Holy Eucharist is that the matter be present when the priest pronounces the essential words. However, to determine what is required that the matter be truly present, the commonly accepted view of men must be regarded as an important factor. Now, when something is enclosed in a vessel intended to contain it, we commonly say that it is present, even though the vessel is closed. For this reason theologians agree that hosts contained in a closed ciborium are truly present to the priest and hence can be validly consecrated. On the other hand, a host concealed under the base of the chalice does not seem to be truly present, because it is not in a normal container; hence, it is doubtful whether it can be validly consecrated. This is true, even though the priest knew that the host were present under the chalice and explicitly wished to consecrate it.

ACTS OF THE THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES

Question: The theological manuals unanimously insist on the obligation of eliciting acts of faith, hope and charity, at least occasionally. Yet, it would seem that most priests rarely, if ever, insist on this obligation in their instructions, both in the confessional and in the pulpit. Are we not bound to bring out this obligation in our sermons and admonitions?

Answer: Certainly there is a grave obligation to elicit acts of faith, hope and charity from time to time—at least once a year, according to the most generous interpretation. However, this obligation is sufficiently fulfilled by deeds which implicitly, or *in actu exercito,* contain acts of the theological virtues. For example, one who goes to Mass with the proper dispositions or who prays devoutly is truly making acts of faith and of hope. One who receives Holy Communion with the fervor due to that sublime action will in practice make acts of divine charity. Accordingly, from the standpoint of the strict obligation to make the acts in question, it suffices that one lead a good Catholic life. Hence, as far as the obligation of priests is concerned with reference to instructing the faithful on this matter, it suffices that in the confessional and the pulpit they urge Catholics to be faithful to all the duties of the Christian life. At the same time, it is certainly commendable for preachers and confessors to suggest the eliciting of explicit acts of faith, hope and charity from time to time. It is an excellent practice to make these acts a part of one's evening prayers.

BINDING FORCE OF A PROMISSORY OATH

Question: Why is it possible to commit a venial sin by transgressing a promissory oath in a matter of light importance, whereas it is commonly taught that a falsehood, however slight, against an assertive oath is a mortal sin?

Answer: A person who takes an assertive oath calls God to witness that he sincerely believes the statement he is making to be true. Now, since it is a grave insult to the all-truthful God to invoke Him as witness to a lie, however slight, there can be no parvity of matter as regards the quality of veracity in an assertive oath. Even a light falsehood intentionally pronounced by one who has taken such is a mortal sin. But one who takes a promissory oath calls God to witness his sincere intention to perform some act or series of acts in future. The direct object of this type of oath is not precisely the fulfilment of what is promised but the intention to fulfill it. Consequently, one who would take a promissory oath without any intention of fulfilling the thing promised would be guilty of grave sin, even though the thing promised is of slight importance. But it is different with respect to the fulfilment. The presumption is that one who binds himself to do something by a promissory oath has the intention of binding himself according to the general principles of obligation—that is, *sub gravi* in reference to what is of grave importance, *sub levi* in reference to what is of light consequence. Hence, a light violation in the fulfilment of such an oath is only a venial sin. It is a sin against religion, though not a sin of perjury in the strict sense.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE PURPOSE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

In the concrete, the goal of the Church's activity is the Church itself. Christ aims all the instrumentality of His Mystical Body precisely at the upbuilding of that Body itself, as He "brings it to live His own supernatural life." His purpose is that "the whole Body of the Church, no less than the individual members, should bear resemblance" to Him, that the entire Church "may portray in her whole life, both external and interior, a most faithful image of Christ." Thus the sanctification for which the Church was born is precisely the sanctity of the Whole Christ, just as the Whole Christ in glory is to be its eternal consummation.

By the attaining of this purpose—which she does in substance by the very fact of her existence—the Church becomes what she is, the *pleroma Christi,* "the filling out and complement of our Redeemer," and, according to "the unbroken tradition of the Fathers," as the encyclical [*Mystici Corporis*] says, "one mystical person" with her Head. There remains a real distinction of individuals. But their union is so intimate, so profoundly rooted in the physical bond of the Holy Spirit, that God calls the whole Church simply "Christ" and the whole Church, no less than her most saintly members, can say in simple truth: "It is Christ that lives in me." All her supernatural activity is a flowering into visibility of the same supernatural activity in her Head. She reveals, through the different organs of her social structure, the action of her Head, continuing forever the different aspects of His redemptive life.

—The Rev. Dr. J. Joseph Bluett, S.J., in "The Theological Significance of the Encyclical 'Mystici Corporis,'" printed in the first volume of the *Proceedings* of The Catholic Theological Society of America (Washington, D. C.: Holy Redeemer College, 1947), p. 57.

Analecta

The first number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for the current year reports the allocution of our Holy Father on Christmas Eve, 1946.[1] In it he adverts to the fact that the Church is neutral and that the role she has to play in regard to the conflicts of nations is that of a mother in relation to feuding sons. Nevertheless he recognizes the obligation inherent in that relation to appeal to the consciences of her children. The fact that his words may be misinterpreted, and even maliciously distorted, will not justify defection on his part. No human veto can prevent him from complying with the mission given him by the Divine Founder of the Church. He laments the delay in the advent of real peace and appeals to the leaders of the world to relieve the anxiety of their subjects, an anxiety which if not soon dispelled is likely to have disastrous results. Human nature is capable of a great deal of suffering, as the war years demonstrated. But there comes a breaking point, and who will say that it is not close at hand.

The appeal for the fulfillment of the hopes of their subjects in this respect is the first of three invitations which our Holy Father makes to the leaders of nations. The second asks that the terms of peace shall be drafted in accordance with justice and reason. His hopes of this accomplishment are tempered with the fear that the terms of peace will be but the fruit of a series of compromises among the interested parties. For that reason he extends his third invitation, that the machinery of correction be set up along with the terms of the peace. If, he asks, even in the physical order a machine that seemed perfect on paper will not work without modifications, how much more true is this in the moral, social, and political order.

He adverts to his appeal in April that nations help one another in relieving hunger and he repeats this prayer, arguing that it is in this fraternal charity that the desire of one nation to dominate another, or even to hold aloof from another, is destroyed.

To accomplish the designs of all God-fearing men it is necessary to return to the Crib at Bethlehem and to find there the inspiration needed to overcome the spirit of injustice which has caused the present sorry plight of the world. When the history of these times is written it will be clear that the light of Bethlehem led phalanxes of priests and laymen to give the testimony to their Faith such as was given by the Franciscan martyrs whom only recently he had elevated to the honors of the altar. Moved by the example of the martyrs, let the faithful sons and daughters of the Church obtain for Christ that peaceful victory that is imperative for the prosperity of the whole human race. The allocution closes with the Apostolic Benediction conferred on the faithful throughout the world.

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIX (1947), 7.

This number of the *Acta* also reports our Holy Father's allocution of Dec. 22, 1946,[2] delivered to the people assembled in the piazza before St. Peter's. In it our Holy Father tells the people of Rome how deeply touched he is at the outpouring of their devotion and loyalty. He adverts to the relations of the people of Rome to him in the dark days of the spring of 1944, and to the ultimate deliverance of the City. He appeals to their sense of pride in the Eternal City while he admonishes them that its destiny today is probably greater than it ever was in history. Let their conduct, he prays, be such as will reveal that they are aware of their responsibility of accomplishing the peaceful spiritual conquest of a world more vast than that conquered by the sword and the legions of the Ceasars. The allocution closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

Three congratulatory letters appear in this number of the *Acta*. One dated Oct. 16, 1946,[3] congratulates His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration. A second, dated July 25, 1946, congratulates Most Rev. George Joseph Caruana, Apostolic Nuncio to Cuba, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration.[4] The third, dated Dec. 8, 1946,[5] congratulates Giovanni Cardinal Mercati on his eightieth birthday anniversary. All close with the Apostolic Benediction.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites has issued under date of Nov. 26, 1946, a formula of prayers to be said after conventual Masses in Italy in accordance with art. 12 of the Concordat.[6]

Under date of Dec. 8, 1946,[7] the same Sacred Congregation issued a decree indicating that all things were in order, as the result of the proof of two miracles wrought after her beatification, for the solemn canonization of Blessed Catherine Labouré. Her beatification was solemnly proclaimed on May 28, 1933.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

The beatification of two Servants of God is declared in Apostolic Letters appearing in the cited number of the *Acta*. Under date of Oct. 20, 1946,[8] the beatification of Marie Thérèse de Soubiran is announced; and under date of Oct. 27, 1946,[9] that of Teresa Eustochium Verzeri.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

THE CHURCH'S CONCERN FOR THE WORKERS

History is witness to the grave concern with which the Church has always treated this question [of the condition of the working man]. Not that the Church has a mandate directly to regulate economic life. But the social and economic orders cannot be divorced from the moral, and it is her privilege and duty to affirm and proclaim the unchanging principles of morality.

They rise above the storm-tossed sea of social controversies as beacons whose piercing light should guide every attempt launched to bring a cure to social cures.

—His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in an Allocution to members of the United States delegation to the International Labor Office at Geneva.

THE BISHOP AND THE PRIEST

The priest has received his priesthood from the bishop. There is, then, a true fatherhood in Christ which must be acknowledged with grateful appreciation. When the priest meditates upon the great graces wrought in himself, he should bear in mind the fact that these divine gifts have come to him through the bishop.

—Fr. A. G. Martimort, in *De l'évêque* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1946), p. 65.

Book Reviews

DE BAPTISMO ET CONFIRMATIONE. By Emanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., S.T.D., Ph.D. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. 453. $5.50.

This book continues Fr. Doronzo's dogmatic tracts in a fashion entirely worthy of its predecessor on the Sacraments in General. Omitting what pertains to the moralists, jurists, and liturgists, as well as the matter proper to the tract on the Sacraments in general. The author has produced a theological work of rare scholarship, limpid order, and originality. Did it exist in an English translation, it would go far towards quenching the thirst of the educated laity for profound theological knowledge.

Fr. Doronzo is every inch a Thomist. Yet his work is not a representation of the *Summa* or a timid adaptation of it. Rather, it is the kind of work one would expect from a student who has become a theologian through his study of the *Summa;* the highly personal and original work of a man who has known and loved Thomas, and so proceeded to think with a mind thoroughly trained by loving contact with Thomas' genius.

A physical description does not do justice to the book. Two hundred and fifty-four pages are devoted to baptism, divided into an Introduction of eighteen pages and seven chapters subdivided into a total of twenty articles. Confirmation is given but fifty-three pages, of which ten are introductory while the rest are divided into ten articles. The procedure is fairly flexible, but in general the author attacks his subject by asking a question, after the manner of the *Summa,* giving all the pertinent references to St. Thomas immediately after the question; he then states the question, historically as well as analytically; exposes the negative side of error and conflicting opinions; then gives the affirmative side with detailed documentation from Scripture, the declarations of the Church, and the Fathers, offering liberal quotations from all these sources; the conclusions of the article are then stated and proved, corollaries drawn, and modern objections posed and answered. This bare statement of procedure, however, gives no idea of the exhaustive scholarship in the field of positive theology, the lengthy quotation from the Fathers and theologians, and, above all, of the sharp edge of perfect order which contribute so much to the genius of the book.

WALTER FARRELL, O.P.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. By the Reverend John Tracy Ellis. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Company, 1947. Pp. vi + 96. $1.25.

Students, teachers, and librarians will be grateful for this booklet. A general critical bibliography of American Catholic Church History has long been needed. There can be no doubt that Fr. Ellis has filled this want, and filled it competently.

Those who were acquainted with the mimeographed bibliography of the same title which Fr. Ellis issued in the spring of 1945 will find here the same work in definitive form. The only considerable change is the omission, in the printed version, of eight typescript pages of periodical articles on Americanism, Modernism, the Apostolic Delegation, and other issues of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This omission was no doubt a considered one; yet the present reviewer is inclined to regret it. The other changes comprise slight alterations in the text and the addition of several new titles which had appeared since April 1945.

The items listed are numbered consecutively to reach a total of 775. Except for twenty-three archival centers and fourteen historical societies, these items are published books and periodicals. After lists of reference and methodological books, and general works, the historical section proper begins. It is divided into: Colonial Period (1491-1789); Middle Period (1789-1866); Later Period (1866-1946). In each of these sections the works mentioned are subdivided into, first, printed sources, and, next, secondary works. Brief critical or explanatory notes follow most of the citations, not only of books and periodicals, but also of archival centers and historical societies.

An index of authors and general subject-matter completes the book, and puts the seal on its usefulness. Stapled binding and paper cover keep the price low. That is as it should be, for students will no doubt find this bibliography indispensable.

ROBERT F. MCNAMARA

THE PRIEST AND A WORLD VISION. By James Keller of Maryknoll. With a Preface by the Most Rev. John F. O'Hara, C.S.C., Bishop of Buffalo. New York: The Christophers, 1946. Pp. xiv + 103. $1.00.

The Preface strikes the keynote of the book in a fitting manner, zeal for the salvation of those outside the Church. The Prelude and the body of the book inculcate this ideal most impressively. The Prelude stresses the opinion of a Japanese professor that the Church might have prevented the luckless warlike adventure of Japan if it had been more widely diffused in that hapless country. The body of the book is divided into four parts: (1) the Obligation to Offer; (2) the Priest and Today's Needs; (3) The Priest and a Shrunken World; (4) As the Priest Goes, so Goes the World. Each of these parts consists of two chapters.

The first part emphasizes the fact that the priest was ordained for the whole world and pictures the comparatively small extent of Christ's kingdom as well as the formidable obstacles which oppose its propagation. The second part shows that we must first strive to influence our surroundings if we are to conceive and foster a genuine missionary zeal. The important part which the priest must play in this enterprise is thrown into strong relief; ways and means are suggested by which the priest may actuate his world vision.

The third part is a moving plea for more priestly vocations and for greater activity in gaining candidates for missionary endeavor. The final section of the book presents Pope Pius XII as a model of universalism, inculcating by his example the duty of Catholics to assert themselves for their fellow-men. Passages from papal encyclicals are quoted to illustrate the part which Catholic laymen and laywomen should take in the spread of their religion. Obviously a book which proposes so vital a message with such clarity, solidity, and eloquence should be read by all priests and should receive the widest possible publicity among the laity.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

INTRODUCTIO IN CODICEM. By Adm. R. P. Udalricus Beste, O.S.B., J.C.D. Third edition. Collegeville, Minn.: St. John's Abbey Press, 1946. Pp. 1024. $8.00.

The obvious success of the second edition of this introduction to Canon Law published two years ago has quickly demanded a third edition. The new edition is a few pages longer but for the most part is the same text. Hence earlier reviews should be consulted for detailed analysis and appreciation.

The following notes, however, are offered to those who may be unacquainted with Dr. Beste's work.

After a suitable treatment is presented for seminary students in the concept of law and in the development of Canon Law, Dr. Beste considers the canons of the Code briefly and with ability. Generally the footnotes give a sufficient cross-reference to the separate parts of Canon Law.

Dr. Beste does not enter into long discussions of disputed points of law. He does, however, submit his own opinion on several points. For instance, he maintains only jurisdictional precepts are included in canon 24. Further, he adheres to the rigorous opinion where the necessity of consultation is stated in the law. Again, short vacations of several days are to be included in the annual vacation permitted in law. Lastly, the entire power of assistant priests is delegated. No part of it is ordinary.

Relative to the obligations of clerics, Dr. Beste furnishes rather more detail. He expounds with examples the full extension of entertainments forbidden to the clergy. He accepts a modification of this extension in the United States. On the other hand, he points out clearly the law which entirely forbids the fostering or the promotion of dances by clerics. He mentions, too, the prohibition of attendance at dances by clerics although promoted by laymen.

Reference is made at the end of this volume to the new Constitution on Papal elections. No details are given although some could easily have been inserted with the reference itself.

It should be indicated that the index of this volume is supplementary to the index of the Code of Canon Law.

EDWARD ROELKER

SLOW DAWNING. By Jane Howes. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. xiv + 268. $3.00.

Slow Dawning is a fascinating description of a long, slow conversion to the Catholic Faith. Though the writer cloaks her identity under a pen name, she remains a vivid personality. She alternates between the attempt to show her own difficulties, and the effort to instruct others. One could only wish that she had done more of both. The revelation of her mental states show a keen analysis; her presentation of Catholic truth shows a penetration and clarity that many a Catholic writer might envy.

The three brief chapters (pp. 83-96) on the Sacrament of Penance are very interesting, though the statements on instructed conscience (p. 86) are open to misinterpretation. Her presentation of Marriage (pp. 99-105) is excellent. The "Stumbling Block," the fundamental immorality of contraception, is presented positively with emphasis on the value of children rather than the negative side of sin. To the statement: "The rhythm method of avoiding conception is, though not encouraged, permitted . . . "should be added: "for a good reason." The sections on the Precepts of the Church are remarkable for their brevity and clarity (pp. 172-183). However there are a few inaccuracies here. Children are bound to hear Mass on Sunday and to abstain on Friday from their seventh year by positive law of the Church. They are responsible for their actions, and may receive Holy Communion, from the time of use of reason. The author leaves room for some misinterpretation by seemingly placing all these things under the use of reason. The Church claims the right to legislate for the marriages of all the baptized, Catholic or not. Mrs. Howes on p. 181 is slightly inaccurate on this matter. These slight errors do not invalidate the book as a whole. In most cases, one may correctly interpret the statements, but they remain ambiguous in themselves.

Aimed at an audience of non-Catholics, this book will be of special value to the priest engaged in convert work. It will help a priest, now aided by long familiarity with formal theology, to appreciate the "uninformed" mentality of an enquirer. It may well be given to the Catholic or non-Catholic who comes with intelligent questions.

The author's steps to conversion are presented in a worth-while chapter, "Stepping Right Along" (pp. 237-46). Her point of departure was: "I don't believe it, and it can't be proved." The first baby-step for Jane Howes was this attitude: "I want to know the truth, whatever the truth may be." Then came a willingness to examine the evidence, followed by the admission: "There might be something in it after all." The fourth step was: "Look at the whole thing and admit it as a beautiful picture. Give it your leave to be true if it can." "The fifth step is to go through the motions. Bring yourself to try the feel of it. Go to Mass anyway." The seventh and eighth step for Miss Howes were two sides of a see-saw on which, recognizing that Catholicism was probably good and true, she threw her weight first against, and then towards believing. "Step eight is taken when you find yourself acting and thinking and talking as if you were a Catholic, and even being sometimes surprised that you are not." Stage nine was the question: "After all, why not?" Stage ten was the plunge under the influence of grace, and the last and permanent state is now the cry of this book to all outside: "Come on in!"

The classification of the steps taken by this convert may well show some of the psychology of conversion, and leads one to wonder whether more attention should not be given to this aspect without underestimating the value of our traditional apologetic approach.

One is tempted to quote at length to give some of the fine flavor of this book. Our only recommendation is to read it. For the priest instructing the convert, for the convert himself, for the Catholic who might wish to get a look "from outside" this book is worth careful reading. It has doctrine, clarity, humor, pathos—and even a very serviceable index.

HENRY V. SATTLFR, C.SS.R.